THE GREEK AULULARIA

MNEMOSYNE
BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

A. W. BYVANCK E. DRERUP B. A. VAN GRONINGEN F. MULLER J. FIL.
A. G. ROOS A. SIZOO G. A. S. SNIJDER H. WAGENVOORT

BIBLIOTHECAE AB ACTIS FUIT FASCICULOSQUE
EDENDOS CURAVIT FRED. MULLER FRUINLAAN 11 LEIDEN

SUPPLEMENTUM SECUNDUM

W. E. J. KUIPER, The Greek Aulularia

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL 1940

THE GREEK AULULARIA

A STUDY OF THE ORIGINAL OF PLAUTUS' MASTERPIECE

BY

W. E. J. KUIPER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL 1940

Copyright 1940 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Holland
All rights reserved, including the right to translate or to reproduce this book or parts thereof in any form

BIBLIOTH. AMSTELAED.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Page
Introduction; a sketch of the action of the Aulularia . . . 1
The date, the author and the title of the original 6
Euclio's character. 12
The gods of the Aulularia 16
Imitation and original. Krieger. Bierma 17
Symptoms of drastic changes noticed in the theme, the characters and the action 20
The entr'actes of the original 26
The scene of action. The stage-setting 34
The origin of the treasure. The Heros and his task . . . 39
The characters. 41
a Strobilus and Pythodicus. Corruption of the text? (p. 43). Revision? (p. 44). Plautus himself the culprit; Dziatzko and Bierma (p. 46). Criticism. In Plautus Eunomia is not Megadorus' housemate (p. 47). An explanation of the discrepancies (p. 49). In the original Lyconides was Megadorus' son (p. 51). Strobilus (p. 51).
b Eunomia; originally she does not figure in the scene II 1, verses 120 ff. (p. 52).
c Lyconides (p. 53).
d Staphyla; her part in the original anagnorisis (p. 55).
e Phaedra. The partus (verse 691) is an innovation by Plautus (p. 56).
Conclusions (p. 59). Megadorus and Lyconides (p. 59). Eunomia in the original (p. 62). Lyconides' share in the exposition (p. 62). Staphyla's part (p. 62). Strobilus and Pythodicus (p. 63). The anagnorisis: Lyconides, Staphyla, Eunomia (p. 64).
Final conclusion. The secret of Phaedra's birth (p. 65).
Excisions and insertions 67
A sketch of the original action (p. 67). I 3 Megadorus-Lyco-

Page

nides, replaced by verses 120—175 (p. 71). II 3 Staphyla-Lyconides (p. 72). III 3 Staphyla-Strobilus (p. 73). III 4 Strobilus-Pythodicus (p. 73). IV 3 Anagnorisis. Lyconides-Eunomia-Staphyla (p. 74). IV 4 Monologue of Eunomia (p. 77). IV 5 Megadorus-Eunomia, see verses 120 ff. (p. 77). IV 6 Megadorus-Euclio (p. 78). IV 8 Lyconides-Strobilus (p. 81). Alterations in Aulularia IV 10 (p. 82).

Rough extent of the excisions (p. 85). Insertions: verses 494—533 (p. 85); verses 415—448, 451—459 (p. 86), reconstruction of the original action between verse 414 and verse 586 (p. 89); verses 624—681 (p. 91); verses 587—607 (p. 96); alterations in verses 608—623 (p. 99).

The Lar's prologue and the place of the Heros-monologue. 100

The 5th act and its basis 107

V 1, Lyconides and Strobilus' stratagem (p. 108). V 3, preparation (p. 111); Strobilus' vision and the Heros (p. 113); Papyrus Hibeh I 5 (p. 115). V 4 Lyconides-Megadorus-Strobilus-Euclio (p. 125).

The lost conclusion of the Aulularia 125

Original and imitation. 126

The causes of Plautus' alterations 128

A comparative survey of Plautus' Aulularia and its original. 133

Register of places 139

ABBREVIATIONS

Bierma = J. W. Bierma, *Het Grieksche origineel van Plautus' Aulularia*, Neophilologus X (1924), p. 49, p. 125.

Burckhardt = Georgine Burckhardt, *Die Akteinteilung in der neuen griechischen und in der römischen Komödie* (1927).

Dziatzko = K. Dziatzko, *Zur Aulularia des Plautus*, Rheinisches Museum XXXVII (1882), p. 261.

Enk II 1 = P. J. Enk, *Handboek der Latijnse Letterkunde* II 1 (1937).

Fraenkel = E. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, Philologische Untersuchungen, Heft 28, (1922).

Francken = C. M. Francken, *Over het origineel van Plautus' Aulularia*, Verslagen en Mededeelingen der K. Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2e Reeks, 11e Deel (1882).

Geffcken = J. Geffcken, *Studien zu Menander*, Programm Hamburg 1898.

Jachmann = G. Jachmann, *Plautinisches und Attisches*, Problemata, Heft 3 (1931).

Krieger = A. Krieger, *De Aululariae Plautinae exemplari Graeco* (1914).

Kuiper, *Diph. i.d. Rud.* = W. E. J. Kuiper, *Diphilus' doel en deel in de Rudens van Plautus* (1938).
Epidic. = Idem, *Het origineel van Plautus' Epidicus* (1938).
Gr. orig. = Idem, *Grieksche origineelen en Latijnsche navolgingen*, Verhandelingen der K. Akademie van Wetenschappen, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel XXXVII, No. 2 (1936).
Two Comedies = Idem, *Two Comedies by Apollodorus of Carystus* (Terence's Hecyra and Phormio), Mnemosyne, Supplementum I (1938).

Legrand = Ph. E. Legrand, *The New Greek Comedy*, English version (1917) of *Daos, Tableau de la comédie grecque pendant la période dite nouvelle* — Κωμῳδία Νέα (1910).

Leo = F. Leo, *Der Monolog im Drama*, Abhand. d. K. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl. N. F. X No 5 (1908).

Wilamowitz, *Schiedsgericht* = Menander, *Das Schiedsgericht (Epitrepontes)* erklärt von U. v. Wilamowitz Moellendorff (1925).

The *Aulularia* is probably the best-known work by Plautus, praised by the readers and mentioned by others. Of course it owes its fame to Molière's *l'Avare* for the greater part, and to a certain extent to the *Warenar* by the Dutch poet P. C. Hooft, but those who know the *Aulularia* will have to admit that the miser portrayed by Plautus has a value of its own, even if Harpagon cannot be recognized in it. It will not be necessary to dwell upon the subject matter of this comedy, for every reader remembers it distinctly. But possibly the way in which Plautus has framed the subject is not so distinctly remembered. Therefore a sketch of the contents may be welcome; it may at the same time be helpful to follow the argument of the treatise better and more quickly.

The play begins with a prologue (verses 1—39). The Lar comes from Euclio the miser's house, and says that he has occupied his place there for many years, as household-god and treasurer. For the grandfather of the present occupant had buried a treasure in the middle of the hearth, and had entrusted it to the Lar. When the old man died, he bequeathed to his son a small piece of land, but did not speak of the gold, miser that he was. His stinginess passed on to his son and to his grandson, Euclio. The latter always neglected his sacrificial duties, as did the other two, but his only child, a daughter, honours the Lar with incense and wine and wreaths. For her sake the Lar has brought about Euclio's discovery of the gold in the hearth, so that she might marry. This is necessary, because a rich young man has violated her. He knows whom he has dishonoured, but she does not know him; her father does not know what has happened to her. In order to bring about the marriage between her and the young man, the Lar will make an old neighbour ask her father for his daughter's hand. This old man is an uncle of the young man who has violated the girl. This communication is the end of the Lar's story. He hears a din of voices coming from the house, tells the audience what is the meaning of this and what is to be expected from it; next he disappears and the play begins.

The first scene (verses 40—78) gives us a first impression of Euclio. We see him drive away his old servant, Staphyla, with threats and caning. He drives her away so far that he may have an opportunity to say what his intentions are and to act on them; he wishes to ascertain, unseen and unhindered, whether his gold is still in the place where he has concealed it. Therefore he goes back into the house, so that Staphyla can give vent to her feelings as to the strange restlessness of her master and the shameful accident which has befallen the daughter of the house. The latter has been dishonoured and is pregnant; this cannot be kept a secret from her father much longer. Then the miser comes out of the house again and a new scene begins (verses 79—119). It appears that Euclio has to leave his house in order to be present at a public distribution of money. Therefore he sends Staphyla back into the house—ordering her not to admit any one—, waits till she has shut the door carefully with the two bolts, informs the audience that he cannot stay away from the distribution of money, because otherwise it would be understood that he is not poor, and leaves the stage.

From the other house there now appears a middle-aged woman, Eunomia, and her elderly brother, Megadorus (verses 120—177). After mentioning her duty and his interest by way of apology she tells him that she has taken him out of the house, because she wants to tell him something that no one else is allowed to hear. Next she advises him to marry. He declines with loud protests and intricate arguments—until he suddenly says that he intends to ask his poor neighbour Euclio for his daughter's hand. Eunomia wishes him luck with his intention, takes leave and departs, whereupon Megadorus carries his plan into execution. For at the very moment he is going to visit his neighbour, the latter returns from his expedition.

Thus the scene of Megadorus' proposal follows immediately (verses 178—267). The suspicious Euclio reluctantly accepts the proposal, because he is convinced that his neighbour suspects that he possesses a treasure and has designs upon it. But he cannot refuse, because the rich Megadorus does not demand a dowry. When at last his proposal has been accepted, Megadorus takes his measures without delay. He wishes to celebrate the marriage as soon as possible. In order to make the necessary purchases he starts for the

market accompanied by his slave, Strobilus. Euclio, too, goes to market, after having told Staphyla what is happening, and instructed her to prepare everything in the house (verses 268—279).

In the next scene (verses 280 ff.) Megadorus' slave, Strobilus, returns from the market accompanied by two cooks and their helpers, two flute-players, two sheep and a variety of viands. He has been instructed to divide everything, one half for Euclio, the other half for Megadorus himself. Therefore he sends Anthrax, one of the cooks, into his master's house, with all the necessary things, and takes the others, Congrio and his companions, up to Euclio's front-door, where he calls Staphyla out of the house to lead them into it. At the moment they enter (verse 362) Strobilus has suddenly disappeared. Another slave of Megadorus', called Pythodicus, speaks about the heavy task which is incumbent on him, to keep in check the rapacity of the cooks. In order to acquit himself of this task he enters his master's house (verses 363—370).

Now it is Euclio's turn to come back from the market where after much going backwards and forwards and many negotiations he has bought nothing but some wreaths of flowers and a little incense, which are destined as an offering for the Lar (verses 371—387). As he is approaching his house he hears a loud noise, while some one there is calling out for a pot. He runs into the house as soon as possible and now an even worse pandemonium arises, so that the cook from the other house, who just then enters the stage in order to go to Congrio to ask him for the loan of a pan, returns hurriedly (verses 388—405). Thereupon Congrio, surrounded by his companions, comes out of Euclio's house and conjures the people of Attica and all the others to clear the way for his flight (verses 406—414). And in fact, as soon as he sees that Euclio is leaving his house, he hurries away. But it does not become a real exit. For the miser calls him back, begins a detailed argument, leaves him standing where he is, because he wishes to fetch his pot of gold from the house, returns with the pot and ultimately sends the cook and his helpers into the house again (verses 415—459). Then he is going to look for a safer hiding-place for his gold. But just then Megadorus approaches; Euclio cannot pass him without accosting him. After having listened to a long monologue by Megadorus and

after complaining, in the course of the conversation he had entered into, that he had sent him cooks and helpers that were thieves, Euclio remains alone at long last. Megadorus enters his house and Euclio makes up his mind to conceal his treasure in the Fides-temple, which is situated on the stage (verses 460—586).

After he has entered the temple, there appears on the stage a man who introduces himself to the audience as the devoted slave of an enamoured youth. The fact is that his young master is in love with Euclio's daughter and has received tidings that she is going to be married to Megadorus; he has sent his slave in order to act as a spy (verses 587—607). He presently gets an opportunity of spying, although in a different sense from what was expected. Euclio returns home from the Fides-temple and talking to himself he unknowingly betrays his secret to the spying slave. The latter steals into the temple as soon as Euclio has disappeared into his house (verses 608—623). But Euclio's suspicions have been aroused; he returns to the stage and rushes into the temple and catches the thief just before he has been able to find and take the money. Consequently it is no use for Euclio to drag him out of the temple, interrogating him and searching him, for he has not got anything. But next Euclio suddenly imagines that he has seen still another thief in the temple, and rushes into it again. Consequently the slave gets the time to hide himself, so that he can spy upon and listen to Euclio anew when the latter, coming out of the temple with his pot, is telling himself that he is now going to bury it in the *'lucus Silvani'* outside the town-wall. As he is going in that direction, the slave has made his plan and follows him closely (verses 624—681).

After their departure Eunomia enters the stage accompanied by a young man, who addresses her as 'mother' and who has evidently told her just then what wrong he has done to Euclio's daughter. He wishes Eunomia to exercise her influence with her brother Megadorus for his benefit. The mother trusts Megadorus to give up his intended marriage without doubt, if she urgently asks him to do so and tells him the good reason viz. that her son, his nephew, has dishonoured the girl—if at least this is really true. As if to prove how true it is there resounds at the same moment a cry of distress out of Euclio's house. It is Phaedra, who calls to *Lucina* for assistan-

ce in her travail. Now Eunomia cannot doubt any longer; she will go to her brother and orders her son to accompany her. So he does, after some moments. For first he thinks it necessary to declare that he wonders where Strobilus, his slave, can be whom he had commanded to wait for him in this place (verses 682—700).

Strobilus returns after his master has entered Megadorus' house. The theft has succeeded; he has got the pot of gold, and he tells the audience how everything was enacted and how he had nearly been caught after all on his return, as Euclio had turned back again on going home. But he had succeeded in evading him and he remains on the alert; when he sees Euclio approaching, he rushes off the stage, in order to conceal his booty at home (verses 701—712).

The miser enters the stage mad with grief at the loss of his gold (verses 713—726). In Megadorus' house Eunomia's son hears his loud wailing and runs out of the house (727). He thinks that Euclio has discovered his daughter's condition and is now giving vent to his grief and indignation. Accordingly he tactfully talks to Euclio about his guilt. But the latter thinks that he declares himself guilty of the theft of the gold. It follows that, when the young man senses the misunderstanding, he has also gauged Euclio's secret and knows that a treasure has been stolen from him and from what place. Therefore Euclio has him swear solemnly that he has not stolen the money, and further that, if he discovers the thief, he will denounce him and will not try to save him any more than ask a portion for himself by way of reward. Having sworn this the young man is allowed to say what is on his mind. He mentions his name, Lyconides, and his relatives (verses 777—780), says that his uncle Megadorus abandons the intended marriage with Euclio's daughter, and confesses the wrong he has done. At the Ceres-festival he has violated the girl, she has a child by him, but he would like nothing better than to marry her, as the law prescribes (verses 781—800). He does not get a reply to his proposal. For Euclio runs away and enters his house; he wishes to make sure of the truth of Lyconides' assertions through the evidence of his housemates. Consequently Lyconides remains on the stage alone thinking that he will presently follow Euclio and meanwhile look about for Strobilus. This brings us as far as verse 807.

Indeed Strobilus appears at the first verse of the next scene. This is the only and partially kept scene of the mutilated conclusion of the play. Strobilus happily and joyfully exults at his large booty; he does not know a richer man than Strobilus. In this triumphant and reckless state of mind he gets sight of Lyconides and thinks to himself that he will share the secret with him and ask whether he can redeem himself. He acts accordingly. He says he has stolen a heavy pot of gold from Euclio and has concealed it at home, in a chest; therefore he would like to be made free (verses 821—824). But this confession has the result that Lyconides orders his slave to fetch the money and give it back. Then Strobilus at first makes as if his whole story has only been a joke, and when his master begins to threaten him, he maintains that he won't give up anything, even if he should be beaten to death. At this communication the text of the *Aulularia* breaks off (verse 833). The two '*Argumenta*', however, say [1]) that, after Lyconides has revealed the matter [2]), Euclio finds the treasure again and gives it to Lyconides together with his daughter and her little son.

Among the studies and treatises which have been written on this comedy of Plautus, the writings about questions of a special nature take an important place. Remarks and suggestions regarding Plautus' changes in the Greek play are not lacking altogether, but only a small number of treatises tackle this subject for its own sake [3]), whereas most writers focus their attention on points of minor importance, e.g. the question of what Euclio's character was, what the title of the Greek original was, what the name of its poet was, what

1) Arg. I verses 13—15.

Euclio
Quom perdidisset aulam, insperato invenit
Laetusque natam conlocat Lyconidi.

Arg. II verses 7—9.

Re omni inspectata conpressoris servolus
Id surpit: illic Euclioni rem refert.
Ab eo donatur auro, uxore et filio.

2) 'Euclioni rem refert' (Arg. II verse 8). Probably the meaning is: 'discloses what has happened', and not as Krieger p. 85 renders it: '*aulam* . . . *apportari iubet*'.

3) Vide pp. 17 ff.

the Greek prototypes of the *magister curiae* in verse 107 and of the *praefectus moribus mulierum* in verse 104 were, and the prototype of the god-protector of the treasure (the *Lar familiaris* of Plautus' prologue), and of the gods *Fides* and *Silvanus*, to whom the gold is entrusted for some time during the action.

Some of these questions have, apart from their specific importance, also a certain importance for the total reconstruction of the original. They will be discussed separately later on. The others, which have this wider importance only indirectly, I will at once treat here in their mutual connection. For the reconstruction of the Greek play it is immaterial whether the γυναικονόμος is meant by the *praefectus moribus mulierum*, and the δήμαρχος by the *magister curiae*, or whether another official is meant [1]. But an affirmative reply to the first question allows us to date the original in the time when Demetrius Phalereus ruled Athens [2]. If this date is correct—and in my opinion there is no reason to doubt it—the chronological facts do not prevent us from calling Menander the author of the

1) But it is of course important that he is an Athenian officer. Krieger's assertion (pp. 15—18) that the *magister curiae* is an invention of Plautus' is without any foundation. His arguments are: 1° the place where the money is distributed (verses 108, 118) is not mentioned; 2° the exit-monologue of Euclio, verses 105—119, is far too long to be authentic. However, the place was implied in the fact of the distribution of the money, and the length of the monologue can be explained from Euclio's dislike of leaving home and from the situation of his house with regard to the exit, along which he leaves the stage (vide pp. 38 f.). The passage is most characteristic of Euclio's state of mind. He does not leave his house due to covetousness, but because he is afraid that people may suspect that he is rich if he should stay away (vide p. 15).

2) This has been the generally accepted opinion since the appearance of F. Hueffner's book, *De Plauti com. exemplis Att. quaestiones max. chronolog.* 1894 (cf. p. 66); see e.g. Legrand p. 13, and Wilamowitz, *Schiedsgericht* p. 136: 'Datiert ist das Drama von Hueffner richtig auf die letzten Jahre der Herrschaft des Demetrios von Phaleron'. I cannot agree with Wilamowitz that the whole of the passage 494—533 appears to be authentic—so that Fraenkel's attribution of this passage to Plautus is incorrect (Fraenkel p. 137)—as a result of verses 503—504 (*praefectus moribus mulierum* = γυναικονόμος). Fraenkel's arguments for the Plautine origin of the *praefectus* are no doubt weak—the sudden turn of thought from what is private to what is public, which in his opinion is typical of Plautus, is e.g. also found in the *Epitrepontes*, verse 153 J.—, but they are convincing with regard to the remaining verses. We must therefore assume that verses 503—504 are authentic and stood between 535 and 536 in the original.

original [1]. But I do not think we have a right to mention the name of Menander with the passionate conviction evinced by Jachmann. After Jachmann's high praise of this drama we almost feel guilty of sacrilege, when we venture to doubt the certainty of Menander's authorship; but this feeling is not enough to change the weak arguments into sound proofs. From the pronouncement: 'denn dies Drama ist als poetische Schöpfung von so erhabenem Rang und trägt den Stempel menandrischen Geistes so leuchtend klar an der Stirn' [2], we can only conclude that Jachmann has not only read the complete works by Menander, Diphilus, Philemon and all their contemporaries, but has also carefully compared them with each other .However, if we remember that he cannot avail himself of any other material than we, and that his knowledge of the art of those comedians is based partly on very incomplete and mutilated originals, and partly on some Latin transformations, then the pathos of a pronouncement as the one quoted above excites our incredulity rather than our agreement. But it is better to keep a level head. One may certainly be inclined to give Menander a good or even the best chance, but one should be prepared for the danger that—to quote Jachmann's cry of distress—'he will be deprived of the most valuable precious stone in the crown which graces his poet's head' [3]. For that Menander's authorship of the original of the *Aulularia* is 'urkundlich sicher' [4], will be denied by anyone reading this document, a part of Choricius [5] quoted by Ussing as early as 1878, and comparing it with the other material.

The part of Choricius runs as follows: **ἣ καὶ τῶν Μενάνδρῳ πεποιημένων προσώπων ..... Κνήμων (ἡμᾶς) δυσκόλους ἐποίησεν**

1) This is done by Ussing (*Plauti Com.* II p. 587), Francken, Geffcken, Legrand (pp. 13, 116), Bierma, Enk (II 1 p. 186) and many others, whom Jachmann, p. 128, classifies in accordance with the degree of their conviction. Critics have rightly not accepted E. J. Thomas' guess (*Plauti Aulularia*, 1913, p. V) that verses 394—397 are an allusion to the attack of the Gauls on the Delphic temple (279 B. C.), a guess which would imply that Menander could not be the author of the original.

2) Jachmann p. 132.

3) Page 129.

4) Page 132.

5) Choricius 32, 73, p. 360 Foerster-Richtsteig, published for the first time by Graux, Rev. de Philol. 1877, p. 228. Ussing *Plauti Com.* II p. 587.

εἶναι, Σμικρίνης δὲ φιλαργύρους, ὁ δεδιὼς μή τι τῶν ἔνδον ὁ καπνὸς οἴχοιτο φέρων; Jachmann, like other critics, places the last words by the side of verses 299—301 of scene II 4 of the *Aulularia,* where Strobilus boasts to the cooks about Euclio's stinginess:

Quin divom atque hominum clamat continuo fidem,
Suam rem perisse seque eradicarier,
De suo tigillo fumus si qua exit foras.

Because of the agreement between those verses and the sample of stinginess mentioned by Choricius, Jachmann considers that proof positive has been given that Smikrines, Menander's φιλάργυρος, is the same as Plautus' Euclio. However, a cool and quiet critic is bound to notice that there is similarity between the two places, but that there is no perfect agreement. For Euclio exclaims loudly that he is being ruined when the smoke of the fire rises from his 'chimney' [1]), but Smikrines is afraid that something will be taken from his house by the smoke. Though the similarity is remarkable, it is not striking, and by no means more striking than that between two other passages, verses 91—97 of the *Aulularia* and a fragment of Menander's Δύσκολος, with which some critics have tried in vain to prove that Plautus' *Aulularia* is derived from the Δύσκολος. Euclio says in verse 91: 'Quod quispiam i g n e m quaerat, extingui volo', and further on (95—97): 'Cultrum, securim, pistillum, mortarium, Quae utenda v a s a semper vicini rogant, Fures venisse atque abstulisse dicito'. In fragment 9 M (136 K) of the *Dyskolos* we read: οὐ π ῦ ρ γὰρ αἰτῶν, οὐδὲ λ ο π ά δ' αἰτούμενος [2]). Every reader will admit that the similarity is rather striking. And yet it appears undoubtedly from the other fragments of the *Dyskolos,* that this play was not the prototype of the *Aulularia,* so that Euclio with all his peevish short-temperedness is not identical with the dyskolos Knemon, about whom Choricius asks whether he happens to turn us, the readers, into grumblers. If Menander's *Dyskolos* had

1) Verse 302 tigillo cod., tuo ligello Nonius, ligillo Pio, Francken. Thomas proposes tegillo, because Nonius explains 'tugurio'.

2) This verse is also quoted from the *Hymnis* by Menander, which does not prove that it does not belong in the *Dyskolos.*

really been the model of Plautus' masterpiece, Bierma's penetration would certainly have succeeded in proving this [1]). In actual fact, however, his endeavour has, in my opinion, only the value of a proof of the reverse [2]), and therefore this negative result warns us against being too positive regarding the authorship of the original of the *Aulularia*. For if, in spite of the great similarity between **'οὐ πῦρ γὰρ αἰτῶν'** and verses **91—97**, the *Aulularia* is not based on Menander's *Dyskolos,* we must thoroughly consider the possibility that, in spite of the similarity between Choricius' words regarding Menander's stingy Smikrines and Plautus' words concerning the stingy

1) As early as 1898 Geffcken (pp. 7 ff.) postulated the identity of the *Aulularia* and the *Dyskolos*. Wilamowitz (Ilb. Jahrb. 1899, p. 526) and Weil (Journ. des Savants 1906, pp. 515 f.) accepted his thesis. Krieger disputed it. Bierma (pp. 52 ff.) starts from the supposition that *Aulularia* 91 ff. = *Dyskolos* fragment 136 K (9 M) and then tries to show that the remaining fragments of the *Dyskolos* fit in very well into the action of the *Aulularia*. However, the analogies are always insufficient. Fragment 129 disapproves of excessive offerings, *Aulularia* 371—384 does not mention them at all; in fragment 130 it does not appear that the cook has actually been maltreated, unlike *Aulularia* 456—457 (which, for the matter of that, is by Plautus himself in my opinion, vide pp. 88 f.); **οἰκειότης** in fragment 135 cannot possibly refer to a marriage, so that a comparison with II 1 of the *Aulularia* does not hold water. Of even greater importance is the fact that the most extensive fragment (128 K, 2 M) is essentially contradictory to the plot of the *Aulularia,* which was also the plot of the original. In that fragment an elderly man (verses 6, 10 **πάτερ**) is spoken to by his son or daughter, or by a slave (cf. *Epitrep.* verses 14, 17, 84 J.), or possibly any young man (cf. Pl. *Rudens,* verse 103). Bierma thinks that the verses originate from a prelude, which Plautus has deleted, and were spoken to Euclio by a slave, probably by his neighbour's slave. However, seeing that the end of the passage runs:

πολλῷ δὲ κρεῖττόν ἐστιν ἐμφανὴς φίλος
ἢ πλοῦτος ἀφανής, ὃν σὺ κατορύξας ἔχεις,

the logical result of Bierma's opinion would be that Euclio's secret was known to somebody else already at the beginning of the play and that that other person informed the miser of this. That is absurd. For it is a fundamental requirement of the plot that Euclio's secret shall be intact until the 4th act, where the slave discovers it without the miser being aware of this.— Finally the scene of action. From fragment 127 K it appears that the *Dyskolos* was enacted in Phyle, at a 20 km' distance from Athens. B. places the original of the *Aulularia* inside Athens, whereby he weakens his thesis. In reality the scene was laid outside the town, but not at a 20 km' distance. See pp. 34 ff.

2) See also Legrand p. 166 and Legrand, Rev. de Philol. 1877, p. 228.

Euclio (verses 299—301), the original of the *Aulularia* has not been written by Menander [1]).

This possibility is not slight, I think. We know that Menander has written 108 comedies [2]). Of these about 90 are known to us by name from fragments quoted in which titles are mentioned. But none of these 90 can have been the prototype of the *Aulularia* on account of its title and its fragments. If therefore Plautus' play is based on Menander, it must be a copy of one of the 18 comedies of which the very name has been lost [3]). Whether it is probable that so excellent a work as the model of the *Aulularia,* if written by the much quoted Menander, should never have been mentioned, is a question to be settled by those to whom his fatherhood is beyond any doubt. But so much is certain that the other plays, too, proposed by the side of the *Dyskolos,* the Ὑδρία and the Θησαυρός, are not suitable as models. Any one wishing to declare the Θησαυρός the model of the *Aulularia,* has first to refute the current opinion that Luscius Lanuvinus has adapted that Θησαυρός in his *Thensaurus* [4]). For the subject-matter of Luscius' play, whose contents we know from Donatus [5]), is entirely different from that of the *Aulularia.* It follows that Menander's Θησαυρός cannot have been at once the model of Luscius' play of the same name and of Plautus' *Aulularia.*

That the Ὑδρία was not Plautus' model is evident from the fragments [6]) and also from the title. For, although we read in the

1) Cf. p. 123, note.

2) Or 109, and according to Apollodorus 105 (Gellius *N.A.* XVII, 4).

3) Francken, p. 217, therefore thinks of an unknown Φιλάργυρος of Menander.

4) I do not think that Krieger's doubt (p. 93) of that current opinion is justified. Although it cannot be positively proved from Terence's *Eun.* verses 9 f. that Luscius' *Thensaurus* goes back to Menander's Θησαυρός, yet this is highly probable. Terence says:

> Idem Menandri Phasma nunc nuper dedit,
> Atque in Thesauro scripsit causam dicere
> Prius unde petitur, e.q.s.

It is obvious that after *Menandri Phasma* we should think of *Menandri Thesaurus.*

5) Ad *Eun.* verse 9.

6) M. Bonnet (*Mélanges Havet* pp. 33 f.), Legrand (p. 168) and others plump for the *Hydria.* Both of them express the opinion that Lyconides appeared on the stage in the very beginning of the play. (Vide p. 17, cf.

scholiast on Aristophanes' *Birds* verse 603: ἐν ὑδρίαις ἔκειντο οἱ θησαυροί, it is clear that the Greek Euclio, just like his Latin namesake, has not kept and conveyed his treasure in a pitcher, but in a pot, a cooking-vessel. This is proved by the rôle which this very pot plays in the plot [1]).

A direct result of the discussions regarding title and author are the considerations concerning Euclio's character. We do not know a comedy by Menander bearing the title of *'the Miser'*; he does speak about miserliness in more than one of his fragments, but none of these would fit into the action of the *Aulularia*. The meaning of these facts is obvious. The miser, who has been portrayed in this play of Plautus, has no relation capable of proof with Menander. Consequently a critic who starts from the firm conviction that nobody but Menander can have written the original of the play, is bound to query whether maybe miserliness was not the chief trait

Legrand p. 423). In that case Quinctilianus' observation (*Inst. Or.* 11, 3) would not militate against the identification with the *Hydria*, but would corroborate it (Cf. Francken p. 216). But the supposition of an opening scene with Lyconides is unfounded, see p. 17, note 5. Apart from this the identification with the *Hydria* is definitely refuted by fragment 1 M (466 K), where a person is speaking who in character and in the circumstances of life does not agree with any of the characters of the *Aulularia*. The passage runs as follows:

ὡς ἡδὺ τῷ μισοῦντι τοὺς φαύλους τρόπους
ἐρημία, καὶ τῷ μελετῶντι μηδὲ ἓν
πονηρὸν ἱκανὸν κτῆμ' ἀγρὸς τρέφων καλῶς.
ἐκ τῶν ὄχλων δὲ ζῆλος, ἥ τε κατὰ πόλιν
αὕτη τρυφὴ λάμπει μέν, ἐς δ' ὀλίγον χρόνον.

1) One should especially note verses 390—393:

Congrio.	Aulam maiorem si pote ex vicinia
	Pete: haec est parva, capere non quit.
Euclio.	Ei mihi,
	Perii hercle ego: aurum rapitur, aula quaeritur.

In this place only a utensil for cooking can be useful, while a pitcher would not make sense. Consequently the word χύτραν or χύτρον must have stood here in the original. I do not think it impossible that a few words from that original passage have been preserved with Pollux 10, 99: ὅταν δὲ Δίφιλος ἐν Ἐπικλήρῳ λέγει 'χύτρον μέγαν παρὰ τοῦ μαγείρου', δῆλον ὅτι τὴν χύτραν λέγει, οὐ τὸν χυτρόποδα. If this is correct, Diphilus' *Epikleros* was the model of Plautus' *Aulularia*. Then verses 390—391 would have to be retranslated: χύτρον μέγαν | παρὰ τοῦ μαγείρου κόμισον ἐκ τῶν γειτόνων· | μικρὸς γάρ ἐστιν οὗτος· οὐ χωρεῖ τὸ πᾶν. With regard to the further rôle of the pot mentioned in verse 390 see pp. 110 f.

of Euclio's character. Actually a thorough study has caused many critics to conclude that Euclio was not originally meant as an incarnation of the type of a miser, because his stinginess appears to be curable. That opinion was so strong with some critics that they declared the scene, where Strobilus narrates a number of striking examples of his stinginess [1]), to be a 'contamination-scene'. Among them are both Leo and Wilamowitz [2]). Contrary to their opinion Jachmann rightly asserted [3]) that this scene belonged to the original play, but he made another mistake as a result of the fact that he did not recognize the comic exaggeration in Strobilus' words [4]). The economy of the propertied classes, even if economy is forced upon them by necessity, is always and everywhere dubbed stinginess by those who do not possess anything, and certainly most vehemently by the servant of a rich Megadoros.

As I have said above, the transfiguration, which would turn the miser into a dyskolos, has not been helpful in the endeavour to find the model of the *Aulularia* in Menander. But this does not signify that the doubt about the purity of Euclio's typification is perfectly unfounded. On the contrary, that uncertainty is easy to understand; but it can be removed, as it is possible to find its cause. Stinginess plays an unusually varied part in the New Attic Comedy. Poets not only knew this vice as a source of ludicrousness, but also as something multifarious. Even in the Ἠθικοὶ Χαρακτῆρες by Theo-

1) Verses 280—320.

2) Leo, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* p. 119; Wilamowitz, Ilb. Jahrb. 1899, p. 518, cf. *Schiedsgericht* p. 136.

3) Jachmann p. 129.

4) That mistake has been pointed out by Enk II 1, p. 188, Mnemosyne II, 1935, p. 281. Verse 87 has been incorrectly interpreted by Jachmann; verse 206 is null and void to prove that Euclio 'in der Nachbarschaft als Ausbund von Knauserigkeit gilt', because it says there: neque illo quisquamst alter hodie *ex paupertate* parcior; verse 672 could only serve as an argument if it were not an addition by Plautus (see pp. 91 ff.). Verses 380—381, 384 are certainly characteristic of Euclio's μικρολογία, but this only means that all that he wished to buy was 'too dear for him' (*cara*), as long as he wished to leave his gold untouched. Therefore it is easy to understand that he 'had not got the money for it' (*aes non erat*, verse 376). This refutes Krieger p. 42, who discovers a contradiction between verse 385 and verses 373, 376—377, and draws the conclusion therefrom that everything up to verse 383 is Plautus' own work.

phrastus, thirty in number, we find four types of that vice side by side, cadging and meanness, stinginess and miserliness [1]. Now if we take into consideration the fact that the stage has certainly not restricted itself to a mere typification, but has given characters, it will be easy to explain in every respect that Euclio's failing, and that as reflected in Plautus' mirror, cannot be registered at once by means of a single well-defined idea. But no matter how the diagnosis will have to run, there can be no doubt but that it was a complicated case, because the patient had become extremely rich unexpectedly and secretly. That his failing was not incurable is evident from the end of the play, which we know from the fragments of the conclusion [2] and from the destined issue [3]. Even Jachmann admits that much, although in his opinion the poet has portrayed in Euclio an incarnation of miserliness. A cure of an innate quality is almost tantamount to a contradiction in terms, and Jachmann has to smooth out that contradiction by means of a dénouement which is so highly sentimental as to baffle reason from the Attic point of view [4]. Anyhow, we shall not be able to measure the exact degree

1) *Charact.* 9 **ἀναισχυντία, 10 μικρολογία, 22 ἀνελευθερία, 30 αἰσχροκέρδεια.**

2) Fragment 3. Ego ecfodiebam denos in die scrobes.
Fragment 4. Nec noctu nec diu quietus umquam eram:
Nunc dormiam.

3) It is a requirement of the theme that Euclio cedes his money as a dowry (cf. verse 27) and a requirement of comedy that he ultimately does so of his own accord.

4) Jachmann p. 138: 'Natürlich erhielt Euclio seinen Schatz von Lyconides, dem Herrn des glücklichen Finders (read: 'thief'), zurück. Da merkt er dass es diesem, wenn er um die Hand der Tochter bittet, gar nicht um das Geld zu tun ist und dass der reiche Jüngling seine Tochter wirklich liebt in all ihrer Armut, wie ihm überhaupt das ganze reiche Nachbarhaus ohne jede Arglist und Feindseligkeit — das muss er nun einsehen — entgegenkommt. Da geht ihm auf, es gibt doch noch anderes in der Welt als arm und reich und ihren Gegensatz, vor allem gibt es die Liebe der Menschen untereinander als ihre schönste und tiefste Beziehung. Diese Erkenntnis drängt ihm mit erwärmender Kraft zum Herzen und löst die eisige Erstarrung, in die seine Seele gefallen war.' Legrand's opinion (pp. 167—168, 170), although it shows knowledge of human nature and is clear and dispassionate, goes too far in some details all the same. E.g., he writes (p. 44, note 2) that Euclio does *not* yield his treasure of his own accord and that it is possible that his failings have remained. The latter falls outside the scope of the play, the former would have to appear from the reconstruction of the conclusion, but is improbable in itself, because it clashes with the spirit of comedy. For a 3rd point vide p. 16, note 3.

of Euclio's curable stinginess before we know what means the Greek poet has applied to rid him of his gold and his obsession. At this stage of our investigation we cannot yet know this, nor can it be gathered by supplying the conclusion of Plautus' play; we can only get to know this by means of a reconstruction of the Greek play in its dénouement and final development. We can, however, say what the 'miser' was like before his cure, for that is unmistakably shown us by the *Aulularia*. At first he was both poor and mean, and so by character he was a μικρολόγος [1]), whose economy (an hereditary economy, which as a result of his hereditary poverty was not incomprehensible, and therefore to a certain extent pardonable) after finding the treasure assumed the form of a morbid stinginess, an uncontrollable, insane fear of losing his riches again. That fear is preponderant in the syndrome; on it is based his suspicion, which causes him to recognize a thief in every one of his fellow-creatures [2]), and to do all that is in his power to prevent people from beginning to suspect his riches. In the same way that he suspects Staphyla, he also suspects his δημόται, and just as he suspects them, he also suspects his rich neighbour Megadorus. That it is his money the latter is after, is beyond doubt to him as soon as the man accosts him [3]). In the course of their conversation his suspicion grows. The proposal of marriage is refused by him until it has been stipulated: 'without a dowry'; but even so he is not at ease. It remains his firm conviction, in spite of everything, that the treasure is the real aim of the grey son-in-law [4]). He suspects Megadorus because of the cook, and he distrusts the cook because of Megadorus. However much the motives of Euclio's actions may have been obscured afterwards by Plautus' changes, we may rest assured that he took his money out of his house in order to forestall Megadorus' supposed sly intentions [5]) and that after the treasure had been stolen from him he suspected nobody more strongly of the theft than Mega-

1) This term is used in connection with the agreement noticed by Francken (pp. 214—215) between verses 377—384 and Theophr. *Charact.* 10, § 12. Cf. Enk, Mnemos. II, 1935, pp. 281 ff.
2) Cf. Legrand p. 170.
3) Verses 40, 109—117, 185, 188.
4) Verses 194—198, 200—202, 216; 220 ff., 238—241, 255—260; 265—269.
5) Verses 391—397, 449—450, 460 ff., 551 ff.

dorus, just as out of distrust and before he wished to listen to his confession, he had Lyconides swear an oath that he would not claim a reward for finding the treasure [1]), and just as he left Lyconides' proposal of marriage unanswered out of distrust, because first he wished to make sure that there was nothing untrue and selfish in his confession of his guilt and of his duty to marry the girl [2]). This is no longer recognizable in Plautus' work, as a result of changes, which will be pointed out later. But that on hearing about his daughter's misfortune the miser forgets his gold for one moment [3]), is not even to be proved from Plautus' work. Here, too, we see that fear and suspicion overpower the man in everything. Therefore it is incorrect to consider his **δυσκολία** as a trait of his character, as Legrand does [4])—it is due to nervous strain and consequently gives evidence of emotion, not of character—or even more to think that the **δυσκολία** is the essence of his being, as would follow from the identification of Euclio with the Knemon of Menander's *Dyskolos*. The greater part of what has been remarked here has to be elucidated or proved by our subsequent argument. Then we shall also demonstrate —I am making this statement here provisionally—that of the three gods in Plautus' play, *Lar, Fides* and *Silvanus*, Lar only has had his prototype in the Greek play. He was a *Heros*, as many critics following Leo have surmised [5]), a family-god or tribal god with a limited domain. The other two gods are no copies, but thoroughly

1) Verses 772—776. Vide pp. 70, 84, 111.
2) Verses 800—802. Vide p. 70.
3) Cf. Legrand p. 170: 'when he hears of them (sc. his daughter's misfortunes), he forgets his lost pot.'
4) Legrand pp. 167—168: 'As for Euclio, I do not think that the position in which he happens to find himself sufficiently explains the rage he displays when he beats Staphyla and threatens her with the most terrible punishment, and covers Congrio with blows, and lavishes insults upon Strobilus. If his strong-box did not afford him so much occasion to get angry, he would doubtless find it elsewhere. Whatever may have been the title of the play that Plautus imitated, Euclio is certainly a **δύσκολος**.' Of the outbursts of anger mentioned only the first is authentic; the scenes with Congrio (verses 415—459) and Strobilus (628—660) have been inserted by Plautus. See pp. 87 ff., 91 ff.
5) Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*[2] p. 211 note 2, Wilamowitz, Neue Jahrb. XXI, 1908, p. 40 (*Schiedsger.* p. 136: 'nicht sicher'), Krieger p. 9, Bierma p. 129. See further p. 36, note 3.

Latin. Therefore I cannot accept the surmise that Fides is Πίστις and Silvanus Πάν [1]). But the proof that they are Plautus' own creations and that Lar represents Heros will be given later.

The problem of the title and the author of the original is not, however unpleasant its insolvability may be, of intrinsic value for the solution of the main question, that of the relation between the original and the imitation. I call this the main question because our judgment of both Plautus and the New Attic Comedy must undergo a great change in proportion to the conclusion that the *Aulularia* appears to be a free adaptation of its Greek model or a faithful imitation. The current view is that it is a rather faithful copy [2]). Although critics have noticed that there is something wrong with Plautus' action at several points, they used to put this down to a corruption of the text or to a revision, which it is thought has only affected the surface. The idea of a contamination, however slight, has been given up [3]). Accordingly critics do not, usually, hold that changes in the action have been made, nor that insertions have been made, except the verses mentioned previously, 494—533 [4]), nor that cuts have been made, unless only at the beginning, where Plautus—it is assumed—has expunged a scene before the prologue, a scene of exposition of Lyconides, who revealed his feelings and obligations towards Phaedra in a monologue or in a conversation with his slave [5]). But however current this view may be, it is not generally accepted. I have already mentioned above that some critics have tried to recognize the prototype of the *Aulularia* in certain plays by Menander. That attempt could not lead

1) Cf. Wilamowitz, *Schiedsgericht* p. 136: 'Man vermag weder die Fides noch den Silvanus griechisch zu machen... (Sylloge 227, 15 wird eine Πίστις geweiht, aber sie ist die römische Fides).' But the author does not explain how these figures have come into the *Aulularia*. See further pp. 34 ff.

2) Vide Enk II 1 p. 186: 'important changes do not seem to have been brought about by Plautus', which is apparently the current opinion.

3) Vide p. 13.

4) Vide p. 7, note 2.

5) Jachmann, Berl. Phil. Woch. 1915, p. 1017, Wilamowitz, *Schiedsgericht* p. 136. Vide p. 11, note 6 with regard to Bonnet and Legrand. This assumption is essentially unfounded, because there was no plausible reason for Plautus to delete the supposed scene.

to any result, unless it was accepted that the Latin adaptation strongly deviated from its Greek model, as is most obvious from the studies by Krieger and by Bierma. I wish to summarize the result of these two studies briefly and to subject them to a concise criticism.

According to Krieger verses 572—627 of the *Aulularia* are chiefly the work of Plautus himself, and the Fides-temple is his own invention [1]. Krieger thinks that in the Greek play Euclio accompanied Megadorus into his house at about verse 571, in order to take a cup of wine with him—without carrying his pot of gold at that moment. While he was in the house there appeared from it Lyconides and his slave Strobilus—which means that they came out of their own house, for according to Krieger they were Megadorus' housemates. The young man made a confidential statement to the slave regarding Phaedra and before going into the house again himself he sent him to Staphyla with a message, so that when Euclio having quenched his thirst went into his own house again, he met Strobilus in the porch. Then followed the scene of Plautus verses 628ff. The infuriated Euclio dragged Strobilus who was as innocent as a lamb out of the house and thrashed him; after which he entered the house again, dug up his gold, went out of the house with it and was secretly listened to and spied upon by Strobilus while he took it out of the town. It follows that verses 628—681 are authentic, but Plautus placed the whole scene before his Fides-temple, and not in front of Euclio's house [2].

The reconstruction rendered above condemns itself by a series of misunderstandings. Leaving slight mistakes on one side I shall mention the worst. They are four in number. Krieger has failed to understand that Euclio conveys his gold to another place out of suspicion against Megadorus, a suspicion which arises after verse 397, when he finds the rabble of cooks in his house. He has failed to see that Megadorus refers to the drinking-bout after the wedding-banquet with his invitation: 'potare ego hodie hic, Euclio, tecum volo' (569). He has overlooked the fact that, if Euclio suspected a slave living

1) Krieger pp. 57—64.

2) Krieger p. 72: 'ex Euclionis ergo aedibus, non e Fidei fano Strobilus v. 628 a sene eiectus est, qui statim furem quem putat iocose scrutatur'.

with his neighbour Megadorus of attempted theft, he would immediately have complained to his neighbour [1]. Nor does he realize that a Strobilus as innocent as a lamb and a treasure carefully hidden in the garden cannot be a reason for Euclio to take his gold away from the house. For if, after the interrogation of Strobilus, he had noticed at home that the hiding-place of the gold was quite intact, he should have left the treasure where it was, because the reason for his suspicion and fear was no longer valid.

Bierma's suppositions regarding the changes made by Plautus are partly dependent on his incorrect surmise that the original of the *Aulularia* was identical with Menander's *Dyskolos,* of which he had of needs to explain the fragments, that have come down to us, on the ground of hypothetical situations, which are not or not quite to be found with Plautus. But for another part they are based on the correct view that Lyconides' conduct—a paragon of negligence and of lax indifference—cannot be redeemed by granting that young man a scene before the prologue of the god, as Jachmann and others had proposed [2]. For this reason Bierma supposes [3] that in the Greek play Lyconides was out of town during the time preceding the fatal day of Megadorus' proposal, but returned full speed on that very day after having been informed of the threatening event, that he sent his slave ahead so as to see how matters were, and came home himself in order to speak to Eunomia, his mother, who took upon her to persuade her brother and housemate, Megadorus, to put off his marriage. Although on account of this sequence of the action Lyconides' conduct becomes pardonable, yet Bierma's reconstruction suffers from the same evil as Jachmann's hypothesis mentioned above [4]: no plausible reason can be found for Plautus having made

1) Krieger's interpretation of verses 587—607 (pp. 58 ff.) is full of discrepancies and of arbitrariness, e.g.: 'Strobilus speaks about Megadorus as if he is not his master; yet he lives in Megadorus' house'. Verse 594 *retinere ad salutem, non quo incumbat eum impellere* means: 'a desperatione servare'. Verse 604 *ero nunc renuntiatumst* means: 'ero a m e nunc renuntiatumst'. Verse 606 *sine omni suspicione,* signifies: 'sine Euclionis suspicione'. Verse 607 *et huc et illuc* means: 'to Euclio's house and to the Fides-temple'.

2) Vide p. 17, note 5.

3) Bierma p. 135.

4) Vide p. 17, note 5.

the supposed change. When he changed a fundamental *donnée* or expunged an important scene, he did so for some reason or other, and those who assume such a change should be able to mention the reason. If no valid reason can be given, the supposition of a change remains valueless.

Therefore we need not be surprised that the *communis opinio,* which is averse to suppositions that cannot be proved, still considers the *Aulularia* as a careful copy of its model, both as to form and general contents [1]. In my opinion, however, that view is entirely wrong, although it is conceivable; I am convinced that this play strongly deviates from its model as to contents, theme and composition. It is the main object of the present study to prove this, and I think that—contrary to the unsolvable questions of title and authorship—we may arrive at full certainty with regard to the contents, the theme and the composition of the Greek play.

The symptoms which justify the surmise of changes are, as is always the case in Plautus' work, of a general and of a special nature. The test of this surmise is the conviction that in the New Attic Comedy dramatic art had reached a stage of formal perfection which made it impossible for its poets to commit elementary mistakes in the development of the theme, in the use of the characters and in the construction of the action [2]. It follows that, if an investigation of the *Aulularia* shows that Plautus is deficient in each of the three

1) Cf. p. 7, note 2. Fraenkel's 'athetesis' of verses 494—533 is fairly generally accepted (Vide Enk II 1 p. 186). The portrayal of the excessive luxury with the poignant contrast of the begging soldier is characteristic of Rome and Plautus. See Ladewig, Zeitschr. f.d. Altert.-W. 1841, p. 1081, Francken, *Plauti Aul.* p. XIX, W. Wagner, *De Plauti Aul.*, pp. 15—16. Fraenkel's further collection of Plautinisms in this play is slight.

2) Needless to say the aforesaid conviction is not a *petitio principii.* It is based on historical considerations, whose correctness has been borne out by the results of an investigation made in detachment from it. The Attic dramaturgy of abt. 300 B.C. had two centuries of intense practice behind it and was moreover based on the theoretical disquisitions of men like Aristotle and Theophrastus. The technical perfection of its products, which can be expected on this ground, is tangible in 6 plays by Menander, whose form was re-constructed not by means of deduction but by means of an analysis of Terence's and Plautus' adaptations. Vide Kuiper, *Gr. Orig.*, 1936.

branches of craftsmanship mentioned, there is a reason to doubt the faithfulness of his imitation. This gives us a right to look into the Latin play for possible traces and remnants of the original state. If we find those traces, we shall be able to discover in what places Plautus has made changes, and on the ground of these data we shall be allowed to attempt to restore the play to its original form. If in this restoration certain elements should come to light which by their very nature could not but compel Plautus to make changes, then the reconstruction may lay claim to credibility [1]).

The subject-matter of the *Aulularia* is, as every reader will see, twofold; there is a twofold plot, and there is a twofold unconscious battle, a battle between Euclio and Phaedra for the treasure, and between Megadorus and Lyconides for the bride. These two components of the theme are naturally not detached, but they are connected and interdependent, so that it is expected that they will continuously remain connected in a causal connection, and especially that this connection will be very close and evident at the climax of the plot, the turning-point of the action, that is to say where Megadorus abandons his illusion of marriage and where Euclio discovers the theft of his treasure. These are the two chief events of the dramatic history and therefore it may be demanded that the drama shall fulfil this requirement that it connects those facts with each other as cause and result, so that Euclio shall discover the theft in consequence of the fact that his neighbour Megadorus cancels the marriage. But actually this causal connection is altogether lacking [2]). The fact of Megadorus' abdication is by no means a factor in the wheel-work of the double action, but does not become known to Euclio before he has already discovered the theft. Then it is dealt with in a few verses and in a casual way, as if it were also a matter of secondary importance in the course of the marriage-complication [3]).

1) Vide p. 17, note 5; p. 19f.

2) Legrand p. 310 says that the two parts of the theme are connected 'as closely as possible', but he does not consider what is possible and what is impossible.

3) I think that Jachmann has overlooked this when on p. 138 of his eulogy of the *Aulularia* he spoke of a 'höchst geistreich geschlungene und in gewaltiger Steigerung emporgeführte Handlung'.

A similar imperfection may be noticed in the use of the characters. Not one of them, except Euclio and the cooks, performs such a function as we should expect them to do by virtue of dramatic tradition, of personal character, of probability, or of one of these three causes. Lyconides, the *jeune premier* of the comedy, does not make his appearance before verse 682, and without any reason being mentioned for his absence until then [1]). As to Phaedra's responsible nurse Staphyla, all that she does in the play is to give vent to useless wailing and sighing [2]). And we are leaving deeds alone; she does not even consider whether she is able to prevent her foster-child's marriage with Megadorus, although she knows full well that the disgrace of her pregnancy is bound to be discovered immediately after the marriage [3]). The old Megadorus is represented to us as an inveterate bachelor; no matter what Eunomia, his sister, may say and how she may try to persuade him, he will not hear of a marriage.... until he suddenly reveals his plan: he is going to marry Euclio's daughter [4]). Later on, when he has to break off his engagement and that almost at the very time of the wedding, he does not even take the trouble to inform the bride's father of it personally; his nephew Lyconides communicates the news to Euclio [5]). Does Megadorus perhaps feel the tragic part he performs? Eunomia leaves the house with her brother, as if she lives in the same house (verse 120), and many critics consider this 'as if' as actual fact, with which one has to reckon in interpreting her further action, but other critics maintain and allege very good grounds for their assertion, that she is not an inmate of Megadorus' house: she has only paid a visit to him, leaves him again after their conversation (verse 175) in order to go to her own house, which is situated outside the stage, and returns thence in verse 682 together

1) This has caused the surprise of many critics. Vide pp. 17 ff.

2) Verses 74 ff., 274 ff.

3) Vide verses 276 f.

4) This absurdity is wrongly attributed to Plautus' lyricizing of II 1 (verses 120 ff.). The improbability is not that Megadorus gives in too suddenly (Legrand p. 241), but that giving in is out of the question altogether, because he had previously determined to marry Phaedra. For the same reason it is also wrong to attribute his 'change' to the influence of the god of the prologue (Legrand, p. 395). For there is no change.

5) Verse 783.

with her son Lyconides, who due to her communications has heard about Megadorus' intention to marry Phaedra. In my opinion it is very probable that that is what Plautus has meant and nothing else; I hope to prove this later on. Anyhow, even at this stage of our investigation it may be established that, no matter how we explain Plautus' intention, he is deficient in clarity, which may be called the principal requirement of dramatic technique. A lack of clarity is also in evidence elsewhere in the play. Eunomia enters the stage as early as verse 120, but it does not appear that she has a son before verse 682, and not before verses 779—780 do we hear that that son bears the name of Lyconides and that his father is dead [1]. Such tardiness in the revelation of the most fundamental facts is contrary to all rules, and nobody can have any doubt but that it is Plautus who sins against the rules of the technique of the drama, but not his Greek source. He even goes so far as to leave it to the discretion of the reader to guess Eunomia's action outside the stage, i.e. to gather it later on from what her son tells her, as they enter the stage [2]. And it is really perfectly incomprehensible why Eunomia should accompany her son. We may consider her special intervention in Megadorus' intention to marry Phaedra to be completely superfluous—I cannot refrain from making this statement in this early stage of our investigation. Or is the reason which ultimately compels him to cancel his intended marriage (the pregnancy of the bride caused by his young nephew) so subtle that it does not become valid before it is pointed out by his sister? Nobody will answer this question in the affirmative. This leads us to the conclusion that Eunomia is superfluous among Plautus' *dramatis personae*. Her advice is not necessary to persuade Megadorus to marry, for he is already prepared to contract a marriage, nay he has already made up his mind to do so. Her influence is not necessary to induce him to break off the engagement, for the reason to break it off is of a compulsory validity in itself; and the girl's lover was brave enough to communicate the facts to him [3].

1) Lyc. Meus fuit pater hinc Antimachus, ego vocor Lyconides:
Mater est Eunomia.

2) Verse 682 Lyc. Dixi tibi mater: iuxta rem mecum tenes
Super Euclionis filia e.q.s.

3) Vide pp. 75 f.

The part of the slave, or the parts of the slaves in the *Aulularia* are likewise a source of doubt and argument. Strobilus acts as Megadorus' slave (verses 264 and 280), but in verse 362 he has suddenly disappeared; a certain Fitodicus or Pythodicus, not announced by anything or anybody, takes his place. Two hundred and twenty-five verses farther on Strobilus returns.... as Lyconides' slave (verse 587). We need not be surprised that many critics have taken the first-named Strobilus as a Pythodicus in disguise, that is to say as another slave and not as the same slave Strobilus who acts a part from verse 587 onwards. Whether these critics have found the correct solution of the problem is an open question. This problem, too, will require our attention anew later on. I wish only to point out here that nobody holds the Greek poet responsible for the prevailing confusion. In Plautus' text there is a contradiction which is most probably connected with the way in which he has employed his characters, much to the detriment of the clarity of his action [1]).

Some other peculiarities in the employment of the *dramatis personae* mentioned above also point to mistakes or shortcomings in the structure of the action. It is superfluous to give a complete statement of those cases here, the more so as the list will be long enough without it being complete. It is astonishing, for example, that the slave who accompanies Megadorus to the market in 264 returns as quickly as 15 verses further, and has within that short space of time seen to everything that is necessary for the festival, slaughter cattle and provisions, cooks and flute-players. It is also strange that Lyconides' affection for Phaedra—certainly not an indifferent matter in a love-comedy!—is not communicated to the audience before his slave does so in verse 603 [2]); for the Lar only says that he had violated her in the darkness of night of the Ceres-festival (verses 28, 35—36), and as appears later on he was drunk on that occasion (verses 745 and 794 f.) Consequently that event by

1) Even Jachmann admits in his panegyric (p. 138) that all these characters give a somewhat dull impression. By the side of Euclio they are: 'einigermassen farblos und unlebendig'.

2) Verse 603:
Strob. Nam erus meus amat filiam huius Euclionis pauperis.

no means justifies any assumption of his deep affection. It is highly surprising that the young man knowing (cf. verse 29) what he has done to the girl he loves so tenderly (cf. verse 603) should keep aloof all the time [1]), although we may rely on it that he is able to act. For being a fatherless young man [2]) he is almost entirely his own master. It is extremely surprising that Phaedra's confinement takes place so suddenly (verse 691), and it may be called somewhat incomprehensible that until after the last moment Euclio had not been able to discover the far-advanced state of her pregnancy. And what will Euclio be able to learn in the house at verse 802 when he rushes into it after Lyconides' confession? Lyconides tells us: Staphyla's evidence, to whom 'the matter' was known (verses 806—807). Lyconides only talks some piffle. For precisely the only thing that requires an oral testimony in the case under discussion is not known to Staphyla; she does not know who is the father of Phaedra's child.

There are also absurdities in the action which is connected with the rape of the treasure. For the moment I shall mention one example only. A comparison between verses 676—681 and verses 701—712 furnishes us with the proof that Plautus' Strobilus covers the long way to the *lucus Silvani* and back within a time extending over a scene of less than 20 verses, and that Euclio has covered the same distance one time and a half before 36 verses have been said [3]). Surely one ought to pity the old man who had also to bury his pot within the same short space of time. But Plautus sticks at nothing. He even assures us that by order of Lyconides Strobilus has taken a message to Staphyla [4]), but the scene in which Strobilus receives that order and leaves for the purpose of executing it is not to be found in the *Aulularia.*

All these and many other absurdities, which in my opinion may be considered as structural faults, which could not have been committed by an Attic dramatist of any standing, I shall discuss in detail

1) Bierma (p. 134), too, thinks Lyconides' behaviour indefensible and blames Plautus for it. Vide pp. 19.

2) Cf. p. 23, note 1.

3) Verses 682—700. Verses 677—712.

4) Verse 815.

later on. What has been mentioned here is only a provisional survey of the most striking features and will no doubt demonstrate that there is every reason to doubt the purity and the accuracy of a copy like the *Aulularia*. However, before we can analyse the course and the composition of the action together with the conduct and the doings of the *dramatis personae*, it is necessary that there shall be sufficient clarity with regard to some points concerning the outer aspect of the play. These points are: firstly the division into acts of the original; secondly the scene of action and the setting of the stage; thirdly the place of origin of Euclio's treasure. I shall now treat these three matters.

In order to fix the places of the entr'actes in Plautus' and Terence's models it is customary to start from the divisions found in the Latin texts. This starting-point is useful as a provisional starting-point, but it is unreliable as a basis. For in the first place it is not certain that the division into acts of the Greek models ran parallel with that of the Latin texts and in the second place every division of the Latin texts is the result of more or less recent guess-work. There is no tradition that goes back to the Latin author, in our case to Plautus. In my opinion it would not be possible for such a tradition to exist, because I think it is perfectly certain that Plautus has attempted to arrange the action in his plays in such a way that they might be played without any interval; in which generally speaking he has succeeded. That he has really attempted this, appears, I think, from a communication of Donatus, which gives us every reason to print the Latin comedies without a division into acts [1]). That communication runs thus: 'haec etiam ut cetera huius-

1) The same opinion is held by Ussing, the editor of Plautus (Prolegomena, 1875, pp. 164—169), with whom Hauler (Introd. *Phormio* pp. 52 ff.) and K. Kauer (Introd. *Adelph.* p. 15, note 1) agree. Leo, too, in his edition of Plautus only gives the numbering *pro memoria.* In his work *'The technique of continuous action in Roman Comedy'* (1915) C.C. Conrad tries to show that Plautus does not interrupt his action at any point, but I think that he confuses effort and realization. G. Burckhardt (*Die Akteint. i.d. neuen griech. u.i.d. röm. Kom., 1927)* is more prudent in her conclusions. On pp. 38 ff. she enumerates 12 points in Plautus' comedies, where in her opinion there is a real pause, and thinks it probable that these intervals correspond to a Greek χοροῦ (p. 43). Her final conclusion with regard to Plautus and

modi poemata quinque actus habeat necesse est... quos etsi retinendi causa iam inconditos spectatores minime distinguunt Latini comici, metuentes scilicet nequis fastidiosus finito actu... reliquae comoediae fiat contemptor, tamen a doctis veteribus discreti atque disiuncti sunt[1]).

By virtue of these words three facts can be established: firstly that the Latin playwrights had their comedies enacted without an interval, secondly that they published those comedies without a division into acts, thirdly that ancient scholars have nevertheless attempted to impose a division into acts on those plays, and that into five acts. As far as Terence is concerned we know the result of these attempts, because Donatus has written it down. As to Plautus we do not have any division into acts that has come down to us from antiquity. The oldest attempts at division that we know of date from the time of the Renascence[2]). But whether the work of the '*docti veteres*' has been lost or whether it has never existed, that much is certain that Donatus' pronouncement that every play of the *palliata* had 5 acts[3]), is based on a *petitio principii*. This is especially obvious from the fact stated sub 2 above: the Latin playwrights did not insert any entr'actes in the editions of their comedies. For what reason did they abstain from it? Surely not because they were afraid that the reader would run away while reading, when he had come to the end of an act. The only reason can have been that they attempted on principle to avoid any entr'actes. In order to realize this as much as possible, they tried to construct the action in such a way that no interval of any length was necessary between two

Terence runs as follows: 'Eine Akteinteilung ist bei Plautus und Terenz für uns nicht erkennbar, da ausser an den wenigen vorher angeführten Stellen die Einschnitte keine Merkmale aufweisen, die die Entscheidung vor oder gegen die Ansetzung eines Aktschlusses zuliessen'. (p. 42). In my opinion a real interval of the play occurs only at a few of these points. Those places show that the Latin playwrights have not always succeeded in realizing the continuity of the action. It seems that they have repeatedly indicated considerable differences in time by momentary pauses, if they lacked the means to bridge them over. Similarly they take the liberty to cover a considerable lapse of time of any off-stage action by just a few verses.

1) Praef. ad *Adelph.* I 4 (II p. 4 W).

2) Vide Ritschl, *Plauti Bacchides* (1835) p. 9, Burckhardt p. 36.

3) Praef. ad *Eun.* I 5 (I p. 266 W); praef. ad *Andr.* III 6 (I p. 40 W). Cf. Euanthius, *De Com.* II 2, III 1.

scenes. Now entr'actes formed a fixed element of the composition in their Greek models, as appears from the authentic fragments of Menander, and more than once these entr'actes covered a lengthy space of time; therefore the Latin adapters had repeatedly to change the course of the action in those places in such a way that either the lapse of time was cancelled or was smoothed out by means of an inserted scene. That this is not merely theory and hypothesis is evident time and again, when we compare the Latin plays with the reconstructed schemes of the Greek models [1]). Accordingly the final conclusion has to be that the divisions into acts of our Latin comedy-texts are devoid of sense for these plays themselves, because they clash with the intention of the Latin poets, and that those dispositions are only of importance for the knowledge of the structure of the Greek models as attempts to understand the dramatic action in accordance with the phases of its course. But he who wishes to discover the phases of the original action in the copy has to know that the action of the copy has a tendency to disguise the divisions of its Greek model. And further he has to realize that in the Greek play every interval with an empty stage was not necessarily an entr'acte. Consequently he will not always and exclusively be directed by Donatus' law [2]), which stipulates that, when the stage is cleared, an act has come to an end, but on the contrary he should constantly bear in mind that an 'empty stage' with Plautus or Terence is not an undoubted symptom of a Greek χοροῦ, and besides not the only possible symptom. For on the one hand it was certainly not necessary, although it was not entirely out of the question either, that in the Greek play an interval denoting an insignificant lapse of time, was filled with entr'acte; and on the other hand there is the possibility—and for the reason mentioned above this possibility is not slight—that the adapter has removed exactly those pauses which served to denote a considerable difference in time.

That the model of the *Aulularia* cannot be divided in accordance with the short intervals in the action of the Latin copy is apparent

1) Vide Kuiper, *Gr. Orig.* pp. 295 ff., *Epidic.* p. 63, *Diph. i.d. Rud.* p. 108, *Two Comedies* pp. 95 ff.

2) Praef. ad *Andr.* II 3 (I p. 38 W). Cf. L. Havet, *Les entr'actes dans Térence,* Rev. de Philol. 1916, pp. 5 ff.

at a glance, because this action, after the prologue, is interrupted six times by an empty stage, at verses 119, 279, 370, 586, 681 and 700 [1]). For nobody will assume that the Greek play consisted of a prologue and 7 acts. All critics, Leo excepted, rightly stick for this play, just as for other plays, to the classic number of five acts. Although the original Menander-fragments, limited of size as they are, have only proved the existence of entr'actes in the Νέα and have not furnished us with evidence about the number of acts, yet the number of five has its recommendation in tradition [2]) and is confirmed by the reconstruction of the original plays [3]). One might suppose that the oldest editors of the *Aulularia* would have chosen 4 of the 6 or 7 points mentioned in order to divide the play into 5 acts. But that supposition is only partly correct. They only chose the intervals at 119 and at 586, and added to this on their own authority a separation between 405 and 406 and one between 807 and 808. The latter has no meaning for Plautus' text, but it corresponds to an original entr'acte, as will appear presently. The separation after 405 is neither suitable for Plautus' text, supposing one wishes to divide it, nor for the action in itself, as we may learn from a simple consideration. In verse 397 Euclio rushes into his house in order to drive away the cook and his helpers, whom he supposes to be thieves. Consequently the course of the action requires that they come rushing out as quickly as possible; here is no place for an entr'acte. The time which elapses between Euclio's exit in verse 397 and Congrio's prodit in verse 406 is characteristically brief, and this brief pause is covered by Antrax' small monologue verses 398—405, which it is easy to recognize has been purposely written to fill up this slight lapse of time. Therefore Leo is right to discard the entr'acte after 405. Like Legrand [4]) he rightly demands an entr'acte at 280 for the Greek play, so that the third act began at this

1) Burckhardt (p. 12) even states 9 intervals (119, 279, 370, 397, 586, 623, 627, 681, 700), but explains on p. 40 that the action at 397 and 627 is fairly continuous. In my opinion the same also applies to 623, because Euclio comes out of his house at the moment that Strobilus disappears into the Fides-temple.

2) Vide Legrand pp. 371—374.

3) Vide p. 28, note 1.

4) Legrand p. 374 (*Daos* pp. 468 ff.)

verse [1]. They are perfectly right in assuming that Strobilus needed more time for his visit to the market than the 16 verses which Plautus gives him [2]. Although I shall prove later on [3] that Plautus has expunged a scene between verse 279 and verse 280, which belonged to the 2nd act, yet I remain convinced that the return of Strobilus did not take place before the beginning of the 3rd act. For his return introduces a new phase. Strobilus takes the cook into Euclio's house and this means the beginning of the complication, which was the subject-matter of the 3rd act.

However, when Leo says that the 3rd act ends at verse 370, he is most decidedly mistaken [4]. We see that Euclio (verse 274) has started to the market ten verses later than Strobilus (verse 264). Strobilus returned after entr'acte, in Plautus' play at verse 280, Euclio returned two scenes later, in Plautus' play at verse 371. It is inconceivable that the Greek poet should have granted him an extra entr'acte in addition to these 90 extra verses in order to finish his business, as if that were three times as much as Strobilus'. And this is not the only circumstance that makes us deny to put Euclio's return after the 3rd entr'acte of the Greek play, that is to say as an event of the 4th act. The cook enters Euclio's house at verse 362, and is driven out of it by Euclio at verse 406. His function in the plot is to stimulate the miser's suspicion into an action. He does not come in order to cook meals, but in order to be driven away as a would-be thief, whom Megadorus has sent to steal the treasure. It is therefore imperative that he should stay in the house as short as possible. Therefore Euclio returns when the cook has only just installed himself. We play havoc with the requirement of the plot if we should separate the entrance of the cook and Euclio's return to the stage by means of the unlimited pause of an entr'acte. The very story of the cook was just an essential part of a definite phase of the

1) Leo p. 57.
2) Vide p. 24.
3) Vide pp. 63, 68, 72 f.
4) Leo p. 57. In his system of division into acts the monologue plays an important part (pp. 53 ff.). He thinks that the poets of the Νέα preferably opened and closed their acts with a soliloquy. Therefore, it seems, he considers the clearing of the stage at verse 370 between two monologues (verses 363—370 and verses 371—389) to be proof positive of entr'acte.

comedy, the complication, which in accordance with fixed tradition was the subject-matter of the 3rd act [1]. Here the complication was brought about because the miser found the rabble of cooks in his house, and reached its climax when he took his gold out of his house to another place, because he did not think it safe from Megadorus' snares. We see how everything takes its place in the pattern: the arrival of the cook, the return of the miser, his fright, his suspicion and his fear that rises so high that it makes him remove the treasure. The 3rd act, which began at verse 280, cannot therefore have come to an end at verse 371, any more than at Anthrax' monologue (verses 398—405) already referred to, but it was not ended before verse 586, the point where Euclio conveys his treasure to another place.

It follows that I cannot agree with Leo's opinion that in the original there was no entr'acte at verse 586. He says: 'es ist leicht zu sehen, dass 586 keinen Einschnitt macht' [2]. That may be true as far as the *Aulularia* is concerned, it is not applicable to its model. For there Euclio did not take his pot into a temple situated on the stage, but—and for this opinion detailed proofs will be adduced presently—farther away, to the *heroion,* where he did not hurriedly put it away behind something or other, but where he carefully buried it [3]. The time of his absence cannot therefore have been covered by a single brief scene, as is the case in Plautus by verses 587—607. Consequently Legrand is right when he applies the line of demarcation in Plautus' text at verse 586 to the Greek play [4]. And in this case, too, the structure of the action gives its evidence. The arrival of Strobilus [5], after the exit of the miser, signifies the beginning of the dénouement, which means that this arrival refers to two events, either of which is a part of the dénouement, the theft of the gold, discovered by Euclio [6], and the disclosure of Lyconides' paternity [7]. For Strobilus is both the forerunner of Lyconides and the

1) Vide Kuiper, *Two Comedies* pp. 13 and p. 59.
2) Leo p. 57 note 1.
3) Vide pp. 34—39.
4) Legrand p. 374.
5) Verse 587.
6) Verse 701, verse 713.
7) Verses 682 ff.

predestined thief of the gold [1]. The two components of the double theme, the two secrets, that of the child and that of the treasure, are shown for a while as embodied in Strobilus' person. He announces as it were the 'recognition' in its twofold sense of discovery and disclosure. Therefore I do not think that there can be any doubt about it that with his arrival the chapter of recognition commenced, the act of the anagnorisis, i.e. the 4th act [2].

Legrand splits up the unity of this chapter because he puts a pause at verse 682, where the 5th act begins according to him [3]. It may perhaps be thought that there are good grounds for this. For by means of an entr'acte after verse 681 a difficulty disappears that I have pointed out in the beginning [4]; the long expedition to *Silvanus* gets in this way the time which it requires. However, this reason is not valid for the Greek play, because this difficulty was non-existant there, for in that play there was no expedition to Silvanus. The episodes of Fides and Silvanus have been inserted by Plautus, as will appear later on. But I will not use as an argument what I have not yet proved. Without availing myself of this argument Legrand's opinion can be refuted all the same. As I said just now, and as is also surmised by Legrand, the 4th act, the act of discoveries, began at verse 587. It is utterly impossible for this act to come to an end before anything had been discovered. The anagnorisis, which reveals two secrets, that of Lyconides' unknown guilt (verses 682—700) and that of Euclio's unknown riches (verses 727—807), cannot be separated from Strobilus' arrival, which indeed refers to those two things. And no matter where we put the beginning of the 4th act, it cannot possibly, in its capacity of the act of the anagnorisis, have been ended before that which had to be discovered had actually been discovered. That stage has been reached when Euclio has entrusted the secret of his stolen riches to Lyconides and has listened to what the young man has to confess to him and to ask of him. After that—that is to say at verse 808—the 5th and last chapter began, in which, as a result of the discoveries in IV, Lyconides'

1) Cf. verses 603 ff., verses 616 ff. (verse 680).
2) Vide Kuiper, *Gr. Orig.* p. 273 under Anagnorisis.
3) Legrand pp. 374, 376.
4) Vide p. 25.

proposal of marriage had to result in an engagement, and Euclio's gold had to find the destination meant by the god. In accordance with editorial tradition, present-day editors also begin the 5th act at this point [1]), and rightly so, if they wish to divide the *Aulularia* in accordance with the dramatic phases of development of the Greek play. I call these phases: exposition, preparation, complication, discovery and final development [2]). In Plautus' work 25 verses of the last phase are left over (808—833), because the conclusion has been lost; the 4th phase is represented in his work by verses 587—807, the third by verses 280—586. It only remains for us to fix the line of demarcation between I and II, the exposition and the preparation.

It is usually thought that that line of demarcation lay between verse 119 and verse 120, where Euclio disappears and gives way to Eunomia and Megadorus. But this view is, I think, based on Plautus' misleading text. It is stated that the stage is cleared at verse 119 for the first time during the play proper, and on that account the first entr'acte is put at this point. But three things are overlooked in doing so: firstly that with Plautus every pause is only seeming, secondly that a total change of characters in the Greek play was not synonymous with entr'acte, thirdly that it has been Plautus' intention to cancel actual intervals if possible [3]). In my opinion he has smoothed away such an actual interval by means of verses 176—177. In 171 ff. we learn Megadorus' intention to marry. In that place it is really a mere intention and as such it belongs to the exposition, whose task and function it is to give a sketch and survey of the state of affairs, due to which the actors are going to perform certain actions in the 2nd act. I can mention 5 plays by Menander, *Eunouchos, Andria, Adelphoi, Dis Exapaton,* and *Synaristosai,* where the scheme of the action is given in the exposition, and is not carried out until after an entr'acte, when the action proper has begun with the 2nd act. On the ground of analogy we may therefore consider it probable that in the model of the *Aulularia* the subject matter was arranged in the same way, so that Megadorus did not come in contact with Euclio until after an entr'acte, when

1) Ritschl-Goetz, Leo, Lindsay, Thomas, Cf. pp. 84 f., p. 97.
2) Vide p. 31, note 1.
3) Vide pp. 26 ff.

he made his proposal of marriage. It was not difficult for Plautus to do away with this entr'acte. By means of verses 176—177 he immediately connected the proposal itself with the intention. That in the Greek play 'the scene of the plan' was a part of the first act, we shall see confirmed later on, when the original contents of this scene will have been fixed by means of reconstruction [1]).

The second point concerning the outer aspect of the play is the question of the place of action and the setting of the stage.

After Plautus' miser has rescued his treasure from the Fides-temple he finds a safer hiding-place, the domain of Silvanus outside the town-wall. 'Silvani lucus extra murumst avius, crebro salicto oppletus' he says in verses 674—675. A man who speaks like that, a man who has a Fides-temple next door [2]) and thinking of Silvanus says: 'there is a rough woodland of Silvanus outside the town-wall', such a man is bound to live in the town. There cannot be any doubt but that Plautus conceived as the place of the action a street, a *platea* in Athens. But by no means does it follow that the town was considered as the place of action in his model, too [3]). And not only that, but the features which do not fit in that image are not lacking. Is it not singular that an inhabitant of Athens who is as poor as a church-mouse should have a garden large enough to dig a new pit in 'ten times a day'? [4]) Is it probable that the daughter of a poor miser should be able regularly to offer as a sacrifice to her god wine and wreaths [5]), if she lives in town, where one has not got such things at one's disposal unless one buys them? And is it to

1) Vide p. 62.

2) There were two Fides-temples within Rome. Vide Otto *R. E.* VI 2281, Richter, *Topogr. d. St. Rom* pp. 128, 142.

3) Nevertheless this is the current opinion, which is even held by Bierma (p. 129), although he wishes to identify the original with the *Dyskolos* of which the scene is laid at Phyle. As his reason he states: the cooks who have been hired in the market. Cf. Krieger pp. 9 ff. However, the appearance of the cooks only proves the comparative vicinity of the town, not that the action was performed in the town. Cf. Menander's *Epitrepontes*; the scene of this play is laid in the country, but the cook hired in the market has an important rôle in that play.

4) Vide fragment 3 (denos in die scrobes) and verse 70: decies die uno saepe extrudit aedibus.

5) Verses 24 f.

be believed that a man so poor and so economical as Euclio, who has to live on the proceeds of his patch of land, should have his house in town? [1]) That would not tally with the assertion that we read a few times in Menander that the poor can live best in the country [2]). Again, the estimation, too, which the economical Euclio enjoys in spite of his meanness (verses 215 and 224) can be best understood in rural surroundings. For among farmers and peasants economy counts more as a virtue than in town. But for Plautus' Fides-temple and his 'Silvani lucus extra murum', no one would consider the town as the scene of action.

As to the *fanum Fidei* [3]) this is no doubt a Roman notion [4]). We only hear about an **ἱερὸν Πίστεως** in Attica from late writers who are little reliable in this respect, like Diogenianus and Apostolius [5]). But it is not only the unreliability of the witnesses that prevents us from assuming with Legrand and others that Plautus' Fides is a latinized **Πίστις** [6]). On the stage of Plautus' model there was no room for an **ἱερὸν Πίστεως**, because one of the two houses that were in the front of the stage was inhabited by Euclio and the other by Megadorus. Consequently there is no house at Pistis' disposal, unless

1) Vide verses 13 f. It is true that Lar does not say that the patrimony of the '*agri non magnus modus*' remained in Euclio's possession but no one has ever doubted this. Cf. e.g. Francken, *Plauti Aul.* p. IX, Legrand p. 168, Krieger p. 10, Geffcken p. 7. Characteristic of Euclio's way of living is also the rustic character of his comparison in verses 228—235.

2) Men. *Plokion* fragments 4 and 5 M (405, 406 K), *Georg.* verses 78 ff.

3) Mentioned or meant in *Aul.* verses 583 ff., 608—623, 628—676.

4) Vide p. 17, note 1.

5) Diogen. 2, 80 (*Corp. paroem. Gr.* I p. 209) **Ἀττικὴ πίστις: ἐπὶ τῶν πιθανῶν καὶ πιστῶν καὶ εὐόρκων. Ἱδρύσαντο γὰρ οἱ Ἀττικοὶ ἱερὸν Πίστεως.** = Apostol. 4, 25 (ibid. II p. 316).

6) That *Fides* is the translation of **Πίστις** is thought tot be plausible by Legrand, p. 42. Skutsch (Rhein. Mus. 55 p. 280, note 1) even ventures upon concluding from the *Aulularia* that there was a sanctuary of **Πίστις** in Athens. Accordingly he thinks that Plautus' puns in 585, 615 and 676 have been modelled on **πίστις — πιστεύω**, and derives the joke Fides-fidelia (621 f.) from **Πίστις – πίθος**, as if it would have been possible for Euclio to convey his gold unnoticed in a **πίθος**. Geffcken's opinion (p. 7) is more sensible; to Diogenianus' communication he attributes 'nur accessorischen Wert'. The most sensible plan is, in my opinion, to consider the explanation of the paroemiographer as an aetiological fabrication of the kind that is always invented in order to explain proverbs and old saws.

one wishes to assume that the Attic stage of about 300 B.C. utilized a front with three houses. However, as very much can be adduced against this assumption [1]), we have to conclude, for that reason too, that the *fanum Fidei* is Plautus' own creation, and not copied after a sanctuary of the Attic Faithfulness. This is of great importance. For if that sanctuary was not a part of the Greek stage-front it cannot have played a rôle in the original action. Seeing that Plautus' scene before the temple (verses 624—660) could only be enacted if the audience saw before their eyes the temple and the door whence the miser drags the thief outside, it goes without saying that along with the temple the scene has also to disappear from the play. However, if the Fides-episode is not authentic then the departure to Silvanus (verses 661—681) is not either. For the miser takes his treasure to Silvanus, because he has been disappointed by Fides, from whom the money would have been stolen if he had not frustrated that himself. If that frustration is cancelled, the conveying to Silvanus is also cancelled. Consequently the final conclusion, which will be confirmed later on in many ways, is that Fides and Silvanus have both been invented and inserted by Plautus. That Silvanus represents **Πάν**, as Ussing, Legrand, Bierma and others assert [2]), is as incorrect as the supposition that Fides is an Attic **Πίστις**. It follows that only one god is left for the Greek play, the prototype of Plautus' Lar, a Heros, as I have said before [3]). As

1) My opinion is based on the data supplied by the comedies themselves. From what has been found by archaeologists it only appears that the stage-front was broken in 5 places, not what was the use of those pathways. What Pollux 4, 124 describes is not to be fixed chronologically. But Menander's originals regularly show a stage-front of two houses. Körte (*Menandri reliquiae*, ed. 3, 1938) deviates twice from the rule, and assumes a front of 3 houses in the *Perikeiromene* and the *Kolax*, in the former play to the disadvantage of the action, in the latter on the ground of the dubious verses 109—111. The Attic plays known from Terence and from Plautus all show that normal aspect. *Pseudolus* and *Trinummus* are not exceptions. The third house mentioned therein does not have its front on the stage, but has its entrance in the alley lying by the side of the second house.

2) Ussing, *Plauti Com.* II p. 348; Schuster, *Quomodo Plautus Att. exempl. transtulerit* p. 21; Legrand p. 42; Geffcken p. 7 and Bierma p. 129 for the sake of their identification with the *Dyskolos*; Krieger, p. 72, calls verses 628 ff. authentic on the whole. That verse 680 is authentic is 'proved' by him from *Perikeir.* verse 109!

3) Vide p. 16, note 5. Francken, *Plauti Aul.* p. XVIII, identifies the Lar

he was the only god in the Greek model, Euclio of course put the treasure in safety in his sanctuary (after verse 586). From this again it follows that this sanctuary was not situated in Euclio's house or in his garden. Where are we to look for it then? Outside the stage, and that at some distance on the right-hand side[1]). This is still visible in Plautus' text and is confirmed by the fact shown above, that in the Greek text there was an entr'acte after verse 586 (where Euclio goes away with the pot)[2]). The location of the heros-sanctuary outside the stage to the right appears from Plautus' text, because he says that Euclio cannot carry out his plan to put the gold in safety without passing Megadorus[3]). This situation shows that Euclio moved to the right, for Megadorus approached from the right-hand side, because he came from the market. Consequently the heroion lay to the right. We may specify its location as 'at some distance outside the stage' on the following ground. The entr'acte after Euclio's departure signified that he needed time for hiding his treasure. Consequently he had to walk some distance for

with Hermes, and so does Legrand, p. 42. W. Wagner, *De Plauti Aul.*, (1864) thinks of an indefinite **θεὸς πατρῷος**, E. Pressler, *De Plauti Aul.* (1908) of **'Απόλλων πατρῷος.** Zeus Herkeios or Hestia might just as well be mentioned. But no one has better rights than the Heros, for: first we find that *Lar* is rendered by **ἥρως** in Dionys. Halic. *Antiquit.* 4, 2 and 14; *Mon. Ancyr.* c. 19; Plut. *Mor.* p. 323 C; probably Dio Cass. 76, 3, 3; secondly the **Ἥρως** is a figure of frequent occurrence in the **Νέα** as a god of the prologue, cf. the titles in Meineke, *Hist. Crit.* pp. 580 f.; thirdly some features of Plautus' Lar are typical of the Heros, his rancour because of neglect (verses 15 ff.) and the ingredients of the offering (verses 24 f.). Vide Roscher I 2 pp. 2478, 2507, 2509, 2510; *R.E.* VIII pp. 1115, 1119, 1125. Babrius, too, mentions wine and wreaths (cf. *Aul.* verses 24 f.) as an offering for the Heros in 29, 3: **στέφων τε βώμους καὶ καταβρέχων οἴνῳ.** In spite of the fact that a family might have its special heros (Roscher I 2 p. 2474) and though Babrius 29, 1 f. says: **ἦν τις κατ' οἴκους ἀνδρὸς εὐσεβοῦς ἥρως ἔχων ἐν αὐλῇ τέμενος,** it does not follow that such a family-heros had of necessity to live within the four walls of the house. For the matter of that it will be difficult to prove that the relation between the Heros and Euclio's family was as exclusive as the Lar's. At any rate, after what has been said above (pp. 37—38), there can be no doubt but that the heroion was situated at a considerable distance from Euclio's house.

1) To the right, from the point of view of the spectator.

2) Vide p. 31.

3) Verse 473. Sed Megadorus meus adfinis eccum incedit a foro.
Iam hunc non ausim praeterire quin consistam et conloquar.

this purpose and he had to bury the pot [1]). The latter fact also follows from the further course of events. For Strobilus steals the money by digging it up again [2]).

From the same facts finally the following conclusion is to be made: the scene of action of the original lay no doubt in the country. For if an actor on a stage representing the town of Athens moved to the right, this meant that he went to the centre of the town or to the harbour. If he moved to the left he went to the field. Consequently an inhabitant of the town wishing to bury a treasure had to go to the left, for one cannot bury a treasure near the harbour or in the centre of the town [3]). But Euclio left the stage to the right and there, on the right, outside the stage, he found the spot required, where he could put his gold in safety. Therefore the scene of action was not in town, but outside the town and at some distance from Athens.

It follows that the entourage of the Greek 'Play of the Pot' was an Attic village, which was represented on the stage by two houses, the one of the rich, liberal Megadorus, the other of the poor, mean Euclio. It only remains for us to ascertain which of them lived to the right and which of them to the left, as seen from the auditorium. In order to settle this question we have three indications at our disposal, in verses 104—119, verses 280—362 and verses 371—379, all of which lead us to the same result. In 104 Euclio is going to leave his house, as the '*magister curiae*'—that is the *demarch,* as is supposed [4])—will distribute some money by way of share-out. The place of this official matter was no doubt in the centre of the municipality, i.e. to the right of the stage. As after his decision to go away he needs 15 verses before he has disappeared from the

1) Plautus could afford to ignore the entr'acte, as in his action Euclio's s h o r t absence in the Fides-temple was sufficiently covered by Strobilus' monologue of verses 587—607. Maybe he had placed that temple on the right-hand side of the stage, so that it did not seem to be perfectly absurd that Euclio could not take away his treasure without passing Megadorus.

2) Vide verse 709.

3) Bierma's opinion, p. 129, hat the Greek Euclio could hide (i.e. bury) his gold in the sanctuary of Pan on the Northern slope of the Acropolis (Judeich, *Topogr. von Athen* p. 270, note 14) is hardly plausible.

4) Vide p. 7.

stage, the supposition that he spoke these 15 verses while walking away from his front-door to the right-hand exit is most plausible. If so, his house must have been situated on the left. This conclusion is confirmed by verses 280—362, where the course of events shows clearly what is left uncertain by the corrupt verses 329—330. Strobilus is returning from the market (280), i.e. he enters from the right, along with two cooks and their helpers. The one, Anthrax, has to cook meals with Megadorus, the other, Congrio, has to do the same thing with Euclio. In verse 329 Strobilus points out to both of them where they have to perform their tasks. He says: Tu Congrio eum (sc. agnum) sume atque abi intro illuc et vos illum sequimini: vos ceteri illuc ad nos. The former '*illuc*' is metrically wrong, the latter condemns itself, as it does not create a contrast and has taken the place of the verb which has disappeared. Therefore Goetz reads instead of the first illuc '*illo*' and in the second part of the sentence: '*ite huc ad nos*'. If this is what Plautus has written, we may at once conclude that Megadorus' house lay nearest to the entrance on the right-hand side and Euclio's farthest to the left. But an emended verse is not a sound basis for a proof. However, as Congrio's train proceeds on its way after this verse until it reaches Euclio's door about 20 verses later on, there can be no doubt about the correctness of the situation stated. The third place gives the same representation of things. For when Euclio returns from the market (verse 371), i.e. from the right, he does not see his open front-door before he has spoken 18 verses; he hears the shouting of the cooks, but after that he needs quite a number of verses before he has entered (verse 397).

As the third point I mentioned the question of where Euclio had found his treasure according to the arrangement of the Greek poet. In Plautus' work the Lar tells us about it in his prologue [1]. Euclio's grandfather had buried his gold in the middle of the hearth: 'in medio foco defodit venerans me, ut id servarem sibi' (verses 7—8), and there Euclio has been allowed to find it: 'feci, thensaurum ut hic reperiret Euclio', says the Lar in verse 26. Because of the reasons explained above I think it beyond doubt that the Roman

1) Verses 6 ff.

Lar replaces a Greek Heros, whose sacred domain was situated outside the stage [1]). Therefore it really goes without saying that this domain was the place where Euclio had dug up the treasure which had been buried there years before. To make assurance doubly sure it may be proved, I think, by a simple reasoning. We see that Plautus' Euclio has buried the money, that he had found under the hearth, in his garden again [2]). The fact that Plautus makes his miser act thus irrationally can only be explained from the circumstance that he had made a Lar, i.e. a household god and a god of the hearth, out of a figure that was in the Greek play a tutelary god situated out of the house. For surely what Plautus' Euclio does is both irrational and stupid. Without the least necessity he conveys the treasure, which he found concealed in the safest place imaginable, to a place which was considerably less safe, for he takes it from the hearth in his house to the garden. A miser may be insane, he is by no means silly. He acts as every thinking creature does and consequently he will, if possible, remove a treasure-trove to a safer spot than that where he found it. As the play does not leave room for doubt that the Greek Euclio, too, kept the gold in his garden [3]), that garden must have been a safer hiding place according to his rational opinion than the finding-spot. It follows that the finding-spot lay out of Euclio's immediate reach [4]). And as this spot was no doubt under the supervision of the Heros, the god who in the original performed the task of Plautus' Lar, there is no other possibility than that the miser had dug up his treasure at the heroion. Apparently the heroion was situated in such a way that Euclio might consider the treasure-trove as his legal property with a certain degree of right. Accordingly the heroion lay on Euclio's ground, the little field of which we read that the first miser

1) Vide p. 36, note 3.

2) *Aul.* fragment 3 (cf. verse 70), verses 242—244, verse 467 (gallus ubi erat haec defossa occepit ibi scalpurrire ungulis).

3) For it is hardly to be assumed that all the places mentioned in the preceding note are Plautus' own. Even verses 242—244 alone afford a proof and their authenticity is certainly beyond doubt.

4) The possibility may perhaps be suggested that the money had been found where it was kept, in the garden. However, this would be contrary to what is certain beyond doubt, viz. that it was found on a sacred spot.

bequeathed it to his equally miserly son, but without mentioning the gold which he had buried [1]. We now have a complete picture of the task of the Greek prologue-figure. As the tutelary god of the family he was the keeper of the gold until Euclio found it. To him Euclio returned his treasure when out of fear of Megadorus he thought it was no longer safe in his garden. In this way the treasure came anew under the supervision of the god, who as Phaedra's patron governed the play and carried out his will, as Plautus' Lar says in the prologue [2]. That Heros sanctioned Strobilus' theft, for the immediate result of that theft was that Euclio betrayed the secret of the stolen treasure to Lyconides, so that the gold ultimately reached its true destination. In Plautus' play neither Silvanus nor the Lar have a hand in this part of the matter. This finishes the third point, which has thus been fixed with all its consequences. Therefore we may now return to the characters, in order to study their conduct in detail.

As I have remarked above [3], the character and the rôle of Strobilus, both separately and in combination with the problematic Pythodicus of verses 363—370, set the reader of Plautus a riddle, which, no matter how it is solved, has remained an open question. The difficulty already comes to the fore in the *conspectus personarum,* where Strobilus appears both as the sixth and as the twelfth of the characters, so that we are prepared for the unusual fact that in the *Aulularia* the name of Strobilus does duty twice. In order to prevent confusion a difference is frequently made by means of numbers: Strobilus I, Strobilus II [4]. And indeed,

1) Vide p. 35, note 1. In the prologue of Plautus' Lar the communication of verse 13 follows verse 12 rather abruptly, since the connection between the '*thensaurus*' (12) and the '*agri non magnus modus*' (13) is entirely lacking. In the original this connection had already been brought about by verse 7, because the grandfather had buried the *thensaurus* near the *ager.*—The motif of the treasure in the field is also found in *Fab. Aesop.* 33, apparently a motif from folk-tales. Vide also Gruppe, *Griech. Myth.* p. 410, Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* p. 632 m., P. Lockwood, *The plot of the Querolus and the Folktales of disguised treasures.* Trans. Am. Phil. Ass. 44 (1913).

2) Vide verses 25—33.

3) Vide p. 24.

4) In his edition Leo calls Strobilus I: 'Pythodicus', and accordingly he also replaces the wording of the text ('Strobile', 'Strobilus') in verses

although the two Strobili resemble each other in character, they do not have the same master and their knowledge of the persons and their circumstances is widely different. The former is Megadorus' slave; he goes with him to the market (264) and returns with the cooks and their train (280), but having delivered them he suddenly disappears (362), to the benefit it seems of Pythodicus, whom we have mentioned before [1]. This Strobilus, Megadorus' slave, speaks about Euclio on the ground of a long experience [2] and knows Staphyla, the old maid-servant [3], which may be called logical and plausible since they are neighbours. It cannot be doubted but that Euclio in his turn knew this slave of Megadorus, for how could it be that any one, and that in the country, should not know the servant of his nearest neighbour? But the Strobilus with the figure II, the one of verses 587—681, had never before set eyes on Euclio [4] and their dialogue (verses 628 ff.) proves most definitely

264, 334, 351, 354 by 'Pythodice', 'Pythodicus'. Lindsay distinguishes 3 slaves, Strobilus for 264 and 280—362, Pythodicus for 363—370, and an anonymous 'Servus Lyconidis' from verse 587 onward. The same is done by E. J. Thomas.

1) Verses 362 ff. run as follows:

S t r o b. (*to Staphyla*) Duc istos intro.
S t a p h. (*to the cook and his helpers*) Sequimini.
P y t h o d. Curate: ego intervisam quid faciant coqui:
Quos pol ut ego hodie servem, cura maxumast.

2) Verses 289—320.

3) Verses 350—351:

S t r o b. Heus, Staphyla, prodi atque ostium aperi.
S t a p h. Qui vocat?
S t r o b. Strobilus.
S t a p h. Quid vis?

4) This appears especially from verses 603, 616 and 619. In 603 Strobilus says: 'Nam erus meus amat filiam h u i u s Euclionis pauperis'; so he knows the name of Euclio and knows where he lives, as he indicates by '*huius*'. Spying from behind the altar he hears the words of Euclio (608—615), who has meanwhile entered the stage. Euclio goes into the house, Strobilus appears and exclaims (616 ff.):

Di inmortales quod ego h u n c h o m i n e m facinus audivi loqui:
Se aulam onustam auri abstrusisse hic intus in fano Fide.
Cave tu illi fidelis, quaeso, potius fueris quam mihi.
Atque hic pater est ut ego opinor huius erus quam amat, Euclio.

Evidently Strobilus has concluded that 'this man is probably (*ut ego opinor)* Euclio' from the fact that '*hic homo*' has entered the house in which Euclio lives according to his master's indications.

that the slave is a perfect stranger to the miser [1]). Even Strobilus' soliloquy of verses 587—607 suggests this, in which he introduces himself to the audience as the servant of a certain young man, who loves Euclio's daughter and has heard that Megadorus is going to marry her.

Critics have tried to do away with or solve this problem in three ways. Some of them hold that the whole difficulty is due to an insignificant corruption of the text [2]), and that it disappears immediately if the name of Fitodicus (Pythodicus) over verse 363 is

1) Even from his first words: 'foras, foras, lumbrice qui sub terra erepsisti modo', we hear clearly that Euclio does not know the slave and has no idea who he is. In the further dialogue, too, he nowhere treats him as one would do a slave from the house of one's neighbour.

2) This opinion is held by H. W. Prescott (Proceed. Am. Phil. Ass. 35 (1904) p. XCVIII) and by A. G. Amatucci, *Quaest. Plaut. II* (1906). Krieger, who gives a detailed survey of the diverse opinions on pp. 25 ff., arrives at the same conclusion (pp. 32 ff.). He asserts that the superscription Fitodicus (Pythodicus) over the monologue 363 ff.—which is lacking in D but which occurs in B. J. Z—has crept in. His grounds are: 1. Spengel has proved (Sitzber. philos.-philol. u. hist. Kl. bayer. Ak. d. Wiss. 1883 II 257 ff.) that if only one person remains on the stage, the *codices* do not provide his monologue with a superscription, unless the metre is changed; 2. Lindsay values *codex* D very highly *(Jahresber. über Plautus* 1895—1905, Burs. Jahresber. 130,2, script. lat. p. 122: 'in den ersten 8 Stücken steht der Text von B auf einem Niveau mit D'.). One wonders how on these two grounds the intended proof is to be constructed, as Lindsay has n o t said that D is better than B, while Spengel does n o t assert that the *codices* do not give a superscription when a n e w character enters the stage after it has been cleared. The reply to this question is implied in Krieger's preconception, which makes the appeal to Spengel and to Lindsay and indeed every argument entirely unnecessary for him. He says: 'sed eundem servum, qui cum Staphyla verba fecit, versus 363 sqq. dicere negari non potest'. Evidently he considers that which he has to prove as an undoubted fact, that Strobilus is identical with Fitodicus (Pythodicus). To Krieger the whole difficulty is just this question: how is it that the name of Fitodicus appears over the monologue 363—370. His solution enjoys a certain renown (vide e.g. G. Duckworth, *The unnamed characters in Pl.,* Class. Phil. 33 (1938) pp. 271 ff.). 'Fitodicus servus' is a corruption of a marginal note *'fit odiosus servus'*: 'the slave (Strobilus) becomes angry'. How does Krieger know that the slave (Strobilus) becomes angry? Because in 363 the slave calls out to the cooks who disappeared into Euclio's house: 'curate'. Truly, this is exactly the thundering and richly variegated language which Plautus always makes his characters speak when they vent their anger! *Curate* indeed. Krieger has underrated the difficulties of the problem. In my opinion this has also been done by Bierma, p. 134.

deleted and if verses 363—370 are assigned to Strobilus. If this is done there is only one Strobilus in the whole play, the common slave of Megadorus and Lyconides. At verse 370 he enters Megadorus' house and at verse 587 he appears again from that house. It will be noticed that this solution is extraordinarily simple, but alas it is also extremely naïve. For it perpetuates and enlarges the riddle. For it is impossible that a slave of Megadorus' house should be a stranger to Euclio and should never have seen him before [1]).

A second group of critics explains the matter as follows. A 'post-Plautine reviser' has tied the two slave-rôles together and thus made one single figure out of the two characters, carefully differentiated by Plautus, of Megadorus' slave and Lyconides' slave [2]). If therefore we change Strobilus I into Pythodicus [3]), then—they say—the discrepancy disappears and the course of the action is irreproachable. In other words, they do not charge Plautus himself with the prevailing confusion, but they blame a later reviser, who in view of a revival is thus said to have welded Plautus' two slaves, Pythodicus and Strobilus, into one Strobilus, but who has meanwhile kept the real, old name of Megadorus' slave, Fitodicus or Pythodicus, as the heading of the little scene of 363—370 and that from mere carelessness.

The 'unknown reviser' referred to by those who write on Plautus has always had broad shoulders. He is blamed for much that disturbs the course of the action in Plautus' plays or that clashes with a logical course of events in another way. Such writers show a certain preference for selecting one of the silliest specimens of

1) Therefore Dziatzko's 'solution' (p. 264), too, does not elucidate the matter any further. He thinks that the Strobilus of 587 is not the same as that of 280—362, but is nevertheless a slave in Megadorus' house. Consequently it remains equally inconceivable that Euclio and he do not know each other.

2) This is Goetz' opinion, Acta Soc. phil. Lips. pp. 311 sq., Idem, *Plauti Com.* II 1, *Aul.* praef. p. VIII. Cf. E. Pressler, *De Pl. Aul.* (1908), K. Kunst, *Stud. z. griech.-röm. Kom.* (1919) pp. 118 f., Idem, *Zur Aul. d. Pl.*, Zeitschr. f. oesterr. Mittelsch. I (1924) p. 212, Enk, *De Aul. Plaut.*, Mnemosyne 1919, p. 84.

3) Dziatzko (p. 268) points out that the change of name in the text does not cause any metrical difficulties, and others repeat this. Those who believe in the theory apparently consider that fortuity to be a corroboration of its correctness.

mankind to figure as an 'unknown reviser'. In our case he has changed a scant light into a thick darkness and that without any aim—no matter what is given as his so-called reason—and besides he has not even carried out his ignoble intention well. For in verses 363—370 he has kept Pythodicus as the person who soliloquizes. To this carelessness the critics of the second group owe the inestimable good fortune that they know the real name of Strobilus I in Plautus' unadulterated *Aulularia.*

Yet, however improbable the idea of this revision may be in itself, we might put up with it if by the substitution of Pythodicus' name for that of Strobilus I all the other difficulties in the slave-rôles would have disappeared. But this is by no means the case. For Strobilus II, Lyconides' slave, i.e. the only real Strobilus according to the critics of this category, presents the reader of Plautus with quite a series of problems. Why does he keep his master's name a secret from us? 'Strobilus II' enters the stage in verse 587; not before 100 verses later do we hear that he is called Strobilus, and we hear this from his master (verse 697) [1]. The latter enters the stage in verse 682 and not before verse 779 does he tell us what he himself is called. Why does Strobilus II not tell us that his master is a nephew of Megadorus? Can he really suppose that his audience is sagacious enough to gather this from the context? [2] How is it possible that Lyconides should call Megadorus' house: 'our house' [3], although his slave Strobilus is not an inmate of that house? For it is obvious that the latter sees the scene of action for the first time when he enters the stage in verse 587, and it is perfectly evident that he has never before seen Euclio and that the latter does not know him [4]. The splitting up of the slave-rôle does not solve any of all these difficulties. On the contrary, they are rather a result of that splitting up. It would be an error to think that the difficulties in question are a mere trifle that can be put on

1) Verses 696 f. Lyc. sed servom meum
Strobilum miror ubi sit.

2) Verse 604:
Strob. Eam ero nunc renuntiatumst nuptum huic Megadoro dari.

3) Verse 727:
Lyc. Quinam homo hic ante aedis nostras eiulans conqueritur maerens?

4) Vide p. 42, note 4.

one side as insignificant. The late communication of the name of important *dramatis personae* is something unheard-of in an ancient drama, and the discrepancy regarding where the slave and the master live is staggering. Accordingly we need not be surprised that the idea of revision has not been generally accepted. The disorder must have been the result of a cause which lies deeper than the injudicious manipulations of a hypothetical adapter.

Consequently we should hold Plautus himself responsible for the confusion prevailing; this is the opinion of Dziatzko and of Bierma [1]. Their accusation is justified in every respect. For, once we are sure that the discrepancies mentioned are not due to a fortuitous corruption of the text, and not to the silly whim of a 'post-Plautine reviser' either, it follows that the Latin poet himself is to blame. He has changed the action of his model, but as he did not take the trouble to reflect properly what were the logical conclusions of his changes and to carry them into execution all round, the characteristics of the new and the old state of things intermingle. The discrepancies are most striking in the figure of Strobilus, but Eunomia and Lyconides also show signs of impurity. According to Dziatzko the real cause of the lack of harmony is the circumstance that Plautus has united two families who were originally separated, at the same time giving a kind of seeming unity to the two slaves of those families. The name of Pythodicus—Dziatzko says—furnishes us with proof positive that these slaves were originally two. In his opinion the situation in the Greek play was as follows: Eunomia lived outside the stage with her son Lyconides and with his slave. But Plautus located them in Megadorus' house, situated on the stage. It follows that in all the places where they appear to be Megadorus' housemates, Plautus himself is speaking; where they appear to be not, the original state of things is in evidence. According to Dziatzko Plautus' reason for that change was an attempt at a stronger concentration of the action than that given by the Greek model [2].

1) Dziatzko pp. 261 f. However, he does not consider Plautus to be the only culprit, but thinks that a reviser has even enhanced the obscurity (p. 267). This is superfluous and inconsistent and is rightly rejected by Bierma (pp. 135 f.).

2) Dziatzko p. 266: 'Die Scenerie, das Auf- und Abtreten der Personen

What Dziatzko says about Plautus' reason is of course merely guess-work, and many may wonder if we are justified in ascribing to Plautus artistic motives of this quality. I will pass over this question, because to me it is purely theoretical in this connection, as I think that in the *Aulularia* Eunomia's family does not live in the same house as Megadorus. Surely I need not argue about the reasons of a change that Plautus has not brought about. In my opinion that part only of Dziatzko's theory is correct which gives the general, fundamental postulate: that Plautus himself must have caused the discrepancies and the confusion in his play by his changes. However, the question what those changes were exactly and what their exact consequences were, has been wrongly answered by Dziatzko, which stands to reason seeing that he had an inverted conception of the action and the arrangement in Plautus' *Aulularia*.

That Eunomia is Megadorus' housemate according to Plautus, Dziatzko, like many critics before and after him, infers from the fact that in verse 120 brother and sister enter the stage together from Megadorus' house; she has taken him with her, she says in verse 133, in order to have a confidential talk with him[1]. But as she declares in verses 144—145: 'id quod in rem tuam esse optumum arbitror, te id monitum a d v e n t o', we cannot but conclude that she is paying a visit to her brother because of these good intentions[2]. This conclusion is confirmed by the end of their con-

wurde dadurch einfacher, die Komik der Handlung insofern drastischer, als zwei dem gleichen Hause Angehörige sich, ohne davon zu wissen, um dasselbe Mädchen bewerben; die Lösung endlich ist erleichtert, da sich aus dem Zusammenwohnen...... auf eine schnellere Berücksichtigung der Wünsche...... schliessen lässt.'

1) Verse 133. E u n. Eo nunc ego secreto foras te huc seduxi,
Ut tuam rem ego tecum hic loquerer familiarem.

2) Dziatzko, too, mentions this as a possibility, p. 264: 'So lassen V. 144 f.... vermuthen, dass Eunomia ihren Bruder nur b e s u c h t habe'. Krieger combats this view asserting (p. 21) that '*advento*' means: '*ante aedes advento*', and is therefore the same as: '*tecum aedibus egredior*'. He thinks he can prove this from *Amphitryo* verse 32, where Mercurius enters the stage on coming out of the house and says: '*propterea pace advenio*'. Krieger forgets that Mercurius is speaking to the audience, Eunomia to her companion. On coming out of the house Mercurius addresses those who are outside, whereas Eunomia after having found Megadorus

versation. Apparently she does not go back into Megadorus' house then, but leaves the stage at the side. This appears, I should say, from Eunomia's question, answered and ended with a mutual greeting: '— Numquid me aliud vis?—Vale. — Et tu, frater' [1]. Her question proves that she considers the end of their conversation as the end of her being with Megadorus. This puts out of the question that she is going to do what she supposes he is going to do: go into the house again. That she does suppose this is beyond doubt; for he has followed her out of his house at her request, and that he wishes to make the proposal of marriage immediately is a thing she does not know; therefore she cannot but think that he will enter the house again. Consequently both question and leave-taking prove that she goes elsewhere and at the same time that she does not live with Megadorus. For if she only went away to do an errand she would have to give chapter and verse for her departure, as befits a housewife. As she does not do so, the final conclusion has to be that she has visited her brother because of the particular reason she mentions and that she returns to her own house after having performed her task [2].

Eunomia's second appearance on the stage, in verses 682—695, likewise only fits in the supposition that she does not live with Megadorus [3]. There she says to her son: 'ei hac intro mecum, gnate mi, ad fratrem meum, ut istuc quod me oras inpetratum ab eo auferam' [4]. None of these words shows that she considers 'in here

in the house explains to him the reason of her coming. The weakness of Krieger's thesis also appears from his other arguments. In verse 172 Eunomia says regarding Euclio: '*Novi hominem haud malum mecastor*'; Krieger argues: 'only a neighbour can talk like that about Euclio'.

1) Verse 175 f.

2) Krieger says (p. 22): 'Eunomia's departure cannot be derived from 175'. There is no need for that. It can be derived from 175 that she does not re-enter Megadorus' house; and thence it follows that she leaves.

3) Regarding this verse Dziatzko says (p. 262): 'we shall have to assume that at 682 Lyconides and Eunomia come out of Megadorus' house', and regarding verses 694 ff.: 'they re-enter this house without for the matter of that indicating clearly that they are at home there', after which he again makes the remark (p. 265) that it may seem that they have come from elsewhere. In plain words this means: He who reads Plautus very definitely gets the impression that they have come from elsewhere and enter a house which is not their own.

4) Verses 694—695.

with my brother' as her own home and that of her son; on the contrary, this is the language of a person who enters a house where he can appear as a guest unannounced, but which is not his home. This argument does not stand alone. Eunomia's words at 694—695 are only a confirmation of what must be stated as a fact from verses 587—681. In these verses Strobilus, Lyconides' slave, is the principal character. He is a stranger to Euclio, as appears there, so he is certainly not his nearest neighbour. Consequently he lives elsewhere, outside the stage, and where he lives there his master Lyconides lives and the latter's mother, Eunomia. Summarizing we see that it is absolutely certain, on the ground of verses 145, 175, 587 ff. and 682 ff., that in the *Aulularia* they do not live with Megadorus but outside the stage.

This has been Plautus' idea. But does he not contradict himself anywhere? He does, on one point. When after verse 726 Lyconides comes out of Megadorus' house on hearing the robbed Euclio's clamour, he says: 'quinam homo hic a n t e a e d i s n o s t r a s eiulans conqueritur maerens?'. Lyconides calls Megadorus' house: 'our house'. Are we to assert on the ground of these words that Strobilus and Eunomia live with Megadorus, because Lyconides appears to live there? Or are we to 'purge' Plautus' text by expunging this verse? The former is irrational and the latter indefensible. For if we do the former we remain entangled in inexplicable discrepancies [1]), because then we transpose the difficulties, and if we do the latter we expunge a verse which is indispensable in the context and which in itself does not contain a single characteristic of corruption. This verse has been written by Plautus in this form, and if due to his *'aedes nostrae'* it clashes with Plautus' own supposition, the cause of this can only be that he has given a literal translation from the Greek, showing that carelessness which characterizes his way of working. For, as we have stated above, the discrepancies in his action can only be explained by assuming that he has brought about changes without paying attention to the logical consequences of his changes. Therefore verse 727 may be

1) This is the case with Bierma, who (p. 135) concludes from verse 727 that according to Plautus' intention Lyconides, Eunomia and Strobilus live with Megadorus.

considered as one of the corner-stones of the reconstruction of the Greek play [1].

We now know for certain what conception Plautus had made of the dwelling-places and the movements of his characters. It is also certain that he has changed his model. Is it possible for us to find out what exactly he has changed, so that we can discover the state of things in the Greek play? In my opinion it is, but only if we take all the facts as they are and draw our conclusions from those actual facts. We see that in Plautus' play Eunomia is nowhere called Megadorus' housemate. Therefore there is not the slightest reason to assume that she was Megadorus' housemate in the original play. We see that the only time that Lyconides speaks about his dwelling-place he denotes Megadorus' house as 'our house'. Therefore it is improbable to a very high degree that he had a different dwelling-place in the Greek play. We state that in his monologue 587—607 and immediately afterwards during his contact with Euclio (verses 616 ff., 628—681) Lyconides' slave Strobilus behaves and is treated as a person who is a stranger in the place of action and to the people living there. Consequently those passages must be Plautus' own work [2]. This is nothing new to us. It tallies exactly with our previous conclusion that the scenes before the Fides-temple do not originate from the Greek play [3]. Where then was Strobilus' dwelling-place in the original? Of course in Megadorus' house, where Lyconides lived. For the slave ought to be where his master is. But, it may be asked, does not the same rule hold good for a son and a mother? Ought we not to assume that Lyconides in spite of his *'aedes nostrae'* of verse 727, lived outside the stage, with Eunomia? Surely he could not live in his uncle's house while his mother lived elsewhere? This is indeed unthinkable, and posing unthinkable situations is not solving riddles. But I maintain that there is an essential difference between the rôle of Strobilus and

1) On verse 728 vide p. 82, note 4.

2) Dziatzko (p. 267) is right in saying that in verse 587 Strobilus enters the stage coming from outside. He draws the conclusion that Plautus has preserved the action of the original against his wishes, and that there the action was the logical result of the circumstance that Strobilus lived outside the stage. Both conclusions appear to be wrong.

3) Vide pp. 35 f.

that of Lyconides, so that what is compulsory for the one has the nature of a variable and casual thing for the other. Strobilus' *raison d'être* lies in the fact that he is a slave; his rôle in the marriage, his rôle of a thief, in short his whole function disappears if he is not Lyconides' slave. But Lyconides' function in the drama is by no means based on the fact that he is Eunomia's son. His rôle retains its full value and *raison d'être* even if Eunomia is n o t his mother. A requirement of the theme is just this, that he is Phaedra's lover and rival of old Megadorus, who must be a near relation of his. So it is correct that Plautus has put together what was loosely connected in the Greek play. However, he did not—as has been supposed—put together two households, but two persons. For he made Lyconides into the son of Megadorus' sister and therefore her housemate. Nevertheless he betrays the old state of things by his carelessness: in the Greek play—as appears from verse 727— Lyconides was Megadorus' housemate, and was consequently Megadorus' son. This is the quintessence of Plautus' transformation. He moved Lyconides from Megadorus to Eunomia, and made the father into the uncle and the aunt into the mother [1]). As a result of that change Strobilus obtained a double face in Plautus' play. Whereas the Greek Strobilus had been Megadorus' slave and therefore the slave

1) Now that it is certain that the Greek Eunomia as well as Plautus' lived outside the stage, her dwelling-place can be located more accurately for the original play, I think. The poet very probably imagined it outside the stage on the left-hand side, from the point of view of the audience. For the place where the money was distributed and the market and the heroion were situated to the right, consequently the passage on the right was used 9 times at least (verses 119, 178, 264, 274, 280, 371, 475, 577 ff., 608) and, as will be seen later, on some more occasions. If we imagine Eunomia's dwelling-place, too, on the right, then the left-hand passage remains entirely unused, while all coming and going is concentrated on the right-hand side, so that the balance of the action suffers. Now *Adelphoi, Dis Exapaton, Hekyra* and *Epidikazomenos* show that the Greek used to locate the secondary characters, whose dwelling-place was not fixed as a result of a special requirement, to the left, in order thus to relieve as much as possible the much used right stage entrance. Vide Ter. *Adelph.* verse 439 (Hegio), Kuiper, *Two Comedies* p. 18 note 1 (Philoxenus, Bacchis), p. 56 notes 1 and 2 (Phormio, Ballio). Therefore it may be expected that the same thing has happened with regard to Eunomia. If we imagine her dwelling to have been on the left, then the left stage entrance was used 7 times, as will appear.

of Megadorus' son, his Latin namesake has become a Janus-figure, whose face in front had to be distinguished from his face on the back by means of I and II. He is employed by Megadorus as far as verse 362, disappears, and returns 225 verses later as the slave of Lyconides, who lived far away. His name, which is mentioned late in the play, is reminiscent of his former *ego*, but for the rest he reveals himself as an almost unrecognizable *alter ego* of himself. That unrecognizability is for the greater part due to the rôle which he had to play in the scenes in front of the Fides-temple. I shall return to this later on. Then it will also appear that Pythodicus was Megadorus' second slave, who took over the domestic duties from Strobilus between verses 362 and 363. But first the other rôles claim our further attention.

E u n o m i a comes out of the house along with her brother Megadorus in II, 1 (verse 120), because she wishes to have a confidential talk with him. As there is not a preceding scene where she had entered the house on arriving from elsewhere, the conclusion has been made that brother and sister are housemates. For that two housemates come outside in order to have a confidential talk is by no means unusual in the ancient drama. Eunomia is thus supposed to be the housekeeper of her unmarried brother. She is then doing a noble deed in urging him to marry, because in this way she injures her own position! [1]).

But, as I have said above, this conclusion is erroneous. That is evident from '*advento*' in verse 145 [2]) and from the leave-taking in 175. Plautus meant the action to be as follows: Before the play began Eunomia had come to pay a visit to her brother, and at the end of her visit takes him into the street in order to read him a lecture. A prodit of this type is, it is true, not frequent, but it is not unexampled either [3]). However, it is remarkable that there is not a word to explain the situation. This is very unusual and singular.

1) Legrand p. 509: 'The gentle and modest Eunomia, entirely absorbed in the happiness of her brother'. Cf. Geffcken p. 5.

2) And from verse 147 'quod v e n i s', if Goetz' addition of these words is correct.

3) Vide Pl. *Epidicus* verse 166 (Apoecides and Periphanes), Ter. *Phormio* verse 153 (Antipho and Phaedria). In both cases it is at once obvious that the speakers are not housemates.

Above all it is strange that Eunomia says in verse 145: 'I come to advise you for your own good' [1], as if she had not arrived a long time ago, but just before the beginning of the conversation. The words she says clash with Plautus' supposition and render the authenticity of the whole prodit doubtful. The contents of the conversation strengthen that doubt. We need only realize the solemn timidity with which Eunomia begins to speak, while her advice is only that her brother, the old bachelor, should marry. We need only see with what vehemence Megadorus discards that advice and discharges strongly worded counterarguments, while he has really made up his mind to marry. We need only consider the droll farcicalness of his proof that a man advanced in years should not take a middle-aged wife: 'In case she should happen to get a child it is certainly predestined to be called *Postumus*' [2]. As if the age of the wife enhances her husband's chance to die. We are justified in saying I think, that the proem (verses 120—134) does not fit in with the altercation and that the altercation is not only comical and foolish but also unnecessary, since Megadorus had already made up his mind to marry. Therefore our final conclusion must be that Eunomia does not originally occur in this scene. In the opening scenes of the play the Greek poet did not have an inveterate bachelor with his sister in Megadorus' house, but a widower bent on marrying and his grown-up son, Lyconides.

Plautus' Lyconides—I have pointed this out before [3]—does not behave in such a way as may be expected from a young man in his circumstances according to the tradition of Comedy. It is certain that he loves Phaedra, although we hear this fairly late [4]. He knows—as appears from verse 29 and from his own words in 689—that he has dishonoured her. As 'the master of the house' [5] he has to possess a certain amount of independence towards his

1) Verses 144—145: 'id quod in rem tuam optumum esse arbitror te id monitum advento' (not '*adventaveram*' or '*adventavi*'). The present tense is one of the causes of Krieger's erroneous interpretation, vide p. 47, note 2.

2) Verses 162—164.

3) Vide p. 25.

4) Verse 603:
Strob. Nam erus meus amat filiam huius Euclionis pauperis.

5) Vide p. 23, note 1.

mother, who moreover, is a good, well-meaning woman. And yet he does not take the trouble to save Phaedra from disgrace until the day of her confinement; and that he does take the trouble is the result of mere chance, for if Eunomia had not visited her brother, Phaedra would have been married to Megadorus or have been in child-bed before Lyconides would have noticed anything. Nevertheless Plautus' young lover knew quite well that the confinement was near at hand. This is perfectly obvious from the fact that he is not in the least surprised or astonished when he hears Phaedra's cries [1]). Is it to be believed that that whole course of events has been copied after the Attic model? We doubt it at once when we consider how improbable and how piteous Lyconides' behaviour and attitude are. But we deny it and that very definitely when we consider that in the original play Lyconides was the nearest neighbour of his beloved Phaedra. For in that situation his conduct as it is sketched in the *Aulularia* becomes utterly impossible. We may be sure therefore that Plautus deviates considerably from his model on this point. For the matter of that his supposition that Lyconides knows whom he has dishonoured (verse 29) is not suitable as substruction, i.e. as the basis of a dramatic complication and dénouement. A proper basis would have been if it were supposed that he was in love with Phaedra without realizing that she was the girl he had assaulted in his drunkenness on the night of the Ceres-festival [2]). That the action of the original play was actually based on this foundation will presently appear from concrete data. And meanwhile we note that the wedding-drama in that play had to be developed out of this situation: in the house next to Euclio's there lived a widower and his grown-up son, both of whom, each in accordance with his

1) Verses 691–693:
Phaedra. Perii, mea nutrix: obsecro te, uterum dolet.
Iuno Lucina, tuam fidem.
Lyc. Em, mater mea,
Tibi rem potiorem video: clamat, parturit.

2) In most plays (e.g. *Epitrepontes, Heros, Hekyra*) the young man does not at first know the identity of the girl. If it has been revealed to him before the play begins, he has already made a confession to the girl (vide e.g. *Adelphoi, Georgos*). That he should persist in his silence though knowing her identity, is considered to be objectionable by the Attic playwrights, both for moral and for dramatic reasons.

character and his age, were giving their thoughts to Euclio's daughter.

The old Staphyla knows that part of the secret which she ought to know, by which we mean that her knowledge is both natural and necessary, the former because as the nurse of the motherless Phaedra she is at the same time her confidante, the latter because it is her task to speak in the name of Phaedra, since Phaedra herself does not appear on the stage. So she knows that Phaedra was assaulted on the night of the Demeter-festival and is expecting a child now; but she does not know who is the father, any more than Phaedra. What the Lar says about this (verse 30) is confirmed by Staphyla's own words (verses 74—75, 276—277). This amount of knowledge is as it were legitimate for every piece of the **Νέα** where, just as is the case here, the truth regarding such a secret is to be revealed to the parties concerned by means of anagnorisis. Nevertheless Staphyla takes no part in the 'anagnorisis' of the *Aulularia*; she does not have a rôle in Plautus' *recognitio* of verses 682—700. But that she did have a rôle in the anagnorisis of the model is in evidence in verse 807, where Plautus contradicts himself, because Lyconides hints at a previous fact in the action, which is missing in the *Aulularia.* He has just before confessed to Euclio what wrong he has done to Phaedra, and while the father hurries into the house the young man says to the audience:

Nunc interim spatium ei dabo exquirendi
Meum factum ex gnatae pedisequa nutrice anu: ea rem novit.

This is a phrase without any meaning in the context of Plautus' play, because his Staphyla lacks the knowledge that she would require for the necessary evidence. The only thing she can confirm does not need an oral testimony, as Euclio is going to see it with his own eyes: that Phaedra is the mother of an illegitimate child. And further there is a secondary detail, which Staphyla can confirm: that Phaedra's misfortune took place at the Ceres-festival. Can it be thought that that secondary detail is the '*factum*' or the '*res*' of which Lyconides speaks? It is useless to take that possibility into serious consideration. For to Euclio Staphyla's confirmation of the time and the place mentioned has only slight conclusive force if he

doubts whether Lyconides is the child's father. The suspicious miser of the Greek play wished to have the certainty that Lyconides did not lie with his confession, that he did not cunningly trade on the treasure which was gone at the moment. For this miser was convinced that Megadorus had a hand in the theft [1]). Consequently there was only one thing regarding which he could want Staphyla's evidence as an indispensable confirmation: the paternity of Lyconides. This was the '*res*' referred to in the verses quoted above, but Plautus' foster-mother does not possess the knowledge that is necessary for this evidence, and thence it appears that Plautus has removed a link from the original action. He must have expunged a passage at some point before verse 807, where Staphyla discovered that Lyconides was the lover who had remained unknown. From verse 807 it appears that she has discovered it in the presence of the lover himself, and therefore that expunged passage must have belonged to the original anagnorisis.

The discrepancy pointed out here is not the only fault in the rôle of Plautus' Staphyla. In verse 74 she declares that she does not see a way out: 'Neque iam quo pacto celem erilis filiae Probrum, propinqua partitudo quoi appetit, Queo comminisci'. With these words she refers to the growing danger of the discovery of Phaedra's pregnancy, and as we see she denies the possibility that she may keep the disgrace a secret from Euclio until the end. But for the moment the father does not suspect anything in the least. Therefore it is really a crushing communication for Staphyla when in verse 271 Euclio informs her: 'I have married Phaedra off to Megadorus, she will be married today'. For a marriage means immediate discovery. How does Staphyla put this into words, however? 'Nunc probrum atque partitudo prope adest, ut fiat palam' (verse 276). *Probrum atque partitudo*! The former makes sense, the latter is

1) It follows that according to Euclio's first thoughts Megadorus' son was either accessary to or at least acquainted with the theft. This accounts for the oaths which he had Lyconides swear successively, verses 772—776. In this way he thought he had cunningly and slily made the guileless son into an ally against Megadorus. Thereupon Lyconides confesses his paternity. 'So after all he was right: it was a new trick; apparently the boy wished to appropriate the stolen treasure by hook or by crook.' Both traits have got lost through Plautus' changes. Vide p. 84.

nonsense. A confinement appears from the confinement itself, not from a marriage. What Staphyla means is pregnancy. She speaks of '*partitudo*' exclusively because Plautus wishes to warn the audience that that event is near at hand. If Staphyla should have thought it possible that Phaedra would be in childbed on that very day (a thing known to Plautus), she would have spoken differently, both here and in the exposition. But—it may be remarked—what Staphyla did not yet expect might nevertheless take place, because the child might be born before its time. This is perfectly true, and Phaedra's psychic condition might certainly make us stress that supposition if Plautus himself had not precluded this way out. For without mincing matters Lyconides says to Euclio in 798: 'Nam tua gnata peperit d e c u m o m e n s e post; numerum cape'. '*Numerum cape*'—I keep the speaker to his word. As the starting-point of his calculation he takes the '*Cereris vigiliae*'; the present writer will check his calculation, and prove that it is Plautus who is speaking here, not the Greek Lyconides. The original of the *Aulularia* was performed at the Lenaia in *Gamelion,* the seventh month of the Attic year, or during the Dionysia, in *Elaphebolion,* the ninth month. By the nocturnal Demeter-festival (verses 36 and 795), where Phaedra's misfortune began, the poet can only have meant the great festival of Eleusis, which was celebrated in the middle of *Boëdromion,* that is to say in the third month of the Attic year [1]). For among all the Demeter-festivals it was only the Eleusinian Mysteries which were celebrated under circumstances in which a nocturnal assault, committed in drunkenness, was a conceivable event and acceptable to the Attic audience. In the so-called Lesser Mysteries such an event was very improbable and in the Thesmophoria, where no man was admitted, it was utterly impossible [2]). Seeing that from the middle of

1) A. Mommsen, *Feste d. Stadt Athen* pp. 373 ff., 428 ff., 206 ff.

2) The Lesser Mysteries, in *Anthesterion* (Mommsen p. 405), were a previous initiation without any nocturnal celebration and excessive revelry. If the child was procreated in this month, it would have been born in *Maimakterion,* i.e. two months before the Lenaia or four months before the Dionysia. If the fact of the birth '*decumo mense post*', communicated by Plautus' Lyconides, was based on the Greek text, the child would have been procreated in *Mounychion* or in *Skirophorion,* but in these months we only know Demeter-festivals of a purely practical character and without any nocturnal festivities. If one wishes by all means to take the Thesmophoria as a starting-point, as Koerte apparently thinks one should (vide Krieger p. 81), then Phaedra was in the fifth month of pregnancy during the Dionysia.

Boëdromion up to *Gamelion* four months elapse, and up to *Elaphebolion* six months, we may be sure that the special request to count the '*decem menses*' from conception to confinement does not originate from the Attic playwright. Or is it thought that the atmosphere of the stage, since it gives fiction, excludes any real and exact indications of time? If that had been the opinion of the poets of the **Νέα** they would have rigidly avoided the mention of any calendar-dates and festival occasions and of anything that gives a chronological fixation due to its name or number. However, they did not do anything of the sort, and therefore there is every reason to assume that they not infrequently made their romantic stage-histories fit in with the whole of actual things. It is a well-known fact that they did not lay their scenes in 'ideal spaces', but in a limited domain from their own world [1]. That, similarly, in the action of their plays real events are in evidence is often seen. I have pointed this out with regard to a special case in my analysis of the *Bacchides*, Menander's *Dis Exapaton* [2]. In his *Epitrepontes* Menander gives another proof of that realism. Why did he choose in that comedy the Tauropolia as the time of the adventure of Pamphile? Probably because between Tauropolia and Dionysia (the festival at which the play was enacted) there lay exactly as many months as his history required [3].

What does the number of months, fixed above at four or six, teach us with regard to the facts with which Plautus operates and with regard to the verses in which those facts are communicated? It teaches us that those verses (796b—798 [4]) have been inserted by Plautus and that the *partus* during the performance, at verse 691 [5]),

1) Cf. Kuiper, *Gr. Orig.* p. 85, *Diph. i. d. Rud.* p. 7.
2) *Gr. Orig.* p. 244. Vide also p. 180 (*Synaristosai*).
3) Wilamowitz, *Schiedsgericht*, p. 75, is inclined to identify the Tauropolia with the Brauronia, of which Mommsen *o.c.* p. 453 surmises that they were celebrated in *Mounychion*. If these two conjectures are right, the Tauropolia really occurred 11 μῆνες before the Dionysia, the day on which the foundling was about 30 days old (vide verse 25 J.).
4) Verses 796 ff.:

Lyc. Cur eiulas,
Quem ego avom feci iam ut esses filiai nuptiis?
Nam tua gnata peperit decumo mense post: numerum cape.

5) Verses 691—692:

Phaedra. Perii, mea nutrix: obsecro te, uterum dolet.
Iuno Lucina, tuam fidem.

is his 'innovation'. We shall find this to be the case for the second time further down, when the authenticity of the '*recognitio*' (verses 682—700) will be discussed. But we must first continue the discussion of the *dramatis personae.* For the facts which have been established now give rise to very definite conclusions.

In the Greek play the house next to Euclio's was inhabited by Megadorus and his son Lyconides, who without knowing it were similar in their affection for Euclio's daughter, but different in their confidence in the possibility of their wishes being fulfilled. For whereas Lyconides had to be silent about his love, for a reason which will appear later, Megadorus was on the point of making a proposal of marriage. We have already pointed out that Plautus tries to give the impression that due to Eunomia's visit and as a result of her advice Megadorus suddenly resolves to marry and ask Phaedra to become his wife. However, the text of the *Aulularia* clearly shows that this resolution had already been made by him. Consequently Eunomia's advice is unnecessary and the conversation between brother and sister useless. The sister does not belong in this scene in which the marriage-plan is put forward; but Megadorus' rôle is indispensable. The marriage-affair was one of the components of the theme, which means that the plan of Megadorus had to be revealed by him in one of the first scenes of the play. This theme-part was in his hand and could only start from his house, just as the material of the plot of the treasure was in Euclio's hand and starts from his house in the opening scene. In what form díd Megadorus reveal his plan? In my opinion the chance that this happened in a monologue is nil. For the Greek poet had the obvious opposite number at his disposal for a dialogue with Megadorus: Lyconides. It was Lyconides' natural right that he, a grown-up son, who lived in his father's house, was the first to be informed when the father had decided to contract a new marriage. And furthermore it was a dramatic necessity, as he was his father's unknown rival. For both external and internal reasons Lyconides was in this scene the obvious partner of Megadorus, even more so than Staphyla was the obvious partner of Euclio.

That besides the communication meant he also received the an-

nouncement that his father would also look for a wife for him, may be surmised with a certain degree of justification, but I leave this on one side. More important is the following question. What was Lyconides' natural reaction on hearing about his father's marriage-plan? What does this teach us concerning his knowledge regarding Phaedra and concerning the reason of his timidity? We know that he loved the girl [1]. Therefore it is unconceivable that he should not have considered how he could check his father's plan, because he had a wish to marry her himself. But the notion that he moreover knew already at the beginning of the play that he was legally obliged to marry her, appears to be perfectly absurd now again [2]. If Lyconides had known that Phaedra was pregnant, that he had dishonoured her, he would not on hearing about his father's plan have adopted a passive attitude so as to see whether he might perhaps prevail upon his aunt to do something about it, but he would at once have stopped that plan himself by a frank confession. We should visualize the situation and become aware that we do not see a farce, which is rooted and grows in the absurd, but an Attic comedy, which purports to portray real life. The father in that comedy is a rational man, and so is the son. Can the latter be silent while he clearly realizes that what his father wishes is something hideous, a disgrace before gods and people [3]? Lyconides cannot have known that it was Phaedra whom he had assaulted at the Demeter-festival. I think that this may now be called perfectly obvious from the concrete relations between the characters, and not merely plausible on the ground of the traditional suppositions with which the Νέα used to operate [4]. And I think there are other reasons than purely moral ones, that make this evident. In Plautus' work the love-plot is based on a supposition which from a dramatic point of view is unprofitable and very improbable in itself. Lyconides has recognized Phaedra in the dark, but she has not recognized him: Is scit adulescens quae sit, quam conpresserit, Illa illum nescit (verses 29—30). In the Greek play, where they were each other's

1) Vide verse 603.
2) Verse 29, (cf. verses 688–689, 789 ff.; verse 793: 'ut leges iubent').
3) From *Aul.* verses 688—693 it appears that Plautus' Lyconides is even aware of the results of his assault. Cf. p. 54.
4) Vide p. 54, note 2.

neighbours—country-neighbours, who cannot but know each other—that one-sided recognition would have been an absurdity [1]). It might rather be believed, since Lyconides acted in drunkenness [2]), that he had not recognized Phaedra, but she had recognized him.

Has the original *donnée* become perfectly clear to us after the preceding conclusions? I think not. There is, to begin with, still an obscure element in Lyconides' conduct. Why could he not request his father to give up Phaedra for his sake? He did not know that it was his duty and his right to warn Megadorus, but that ignorance did not entail the necessity that he had to be silent about his own wishes. So there must have been a sound reason preventing him from revealing his love of Phaedra and pleading for it. A timid respect for his father's personal wishes was certainly not of great influence, for Megadorus was a gentle and sensible man. Consequently the cause lay with Lyconides himself and this being so it was certainly connected with his erotic adventure. Apparently he felt that he was not free on account of that event. However, as such adventures only leave behind feelings of obligation in case people foresee social consequences of their deeds, Lyconides must have been convinced on good grounds that he had violated a citizen's daughter, who perhaps would be able to find him in course of time and compel him to confess the deed. Therefore the conclusion can be drawn that he possessed some pledge or other, an ornament or a ring which he had retined and which could be recognized and thus lead to that discovery which no honest man would shirk. This conclusion is corroborated by the practically undoubted fact that in the model of the *Aulularia* Lyconides and Phaedra were connected by such a pledge, because as a tangible token of recognition it was indispensable for the consummation of the anagnorisis. We notice that this pledge had a definite task at the very beginning of the play. For it was through this that on hearing from his father about his marriage-plan, Lyconides could not reveal to him his love of Phaedra, but

1) In the situation imagined by Plautus, in which the young people live in town and are not neighbours, the one-sided recognition in the dark is improbable, it is true, but not utterly absurd.

2) Verses 745, 795.

got into an inner conflict and had to look for reliable advice and support from others.

This throws a bright light on two details of the Greek play. In the first place it appears how Eunomia was dragged into the action there. Lyconides looked for advice and support from her. So she also had a rôle in the original, but not before the model of Plautus' scene of dénouement (verses 682—700), the anagnorisis, where she appeared as the companion of her youthful nephew, fetched from her home by him with the intention that she should temper Megadorus' push. And moreover, it is now confirmed [1]), that Megadorus' scene with Lyconides, by which the marriage-matter was introduced, was a part of the exposition, i.e. of the first act. For no doubt Lyconides has here, after Megadorus' exit [2]), revealed his secret to the audience in a final monologue [3]), just as in the opening scenes Euclio and Staphyla inform the audience of what no one else is allowed to hear [4]). And with that Lyconides disclosed the last of those secret facts, upon which the *dramatis personae* based their thoughts and actions, a half truth and unreliable, contrary to the whole truth, which the god could reveal to the audience.

The question is now what the task of Staphyla and of Strobilus can have been in the action that had to be developed from these data. As I have remarked before [5]), the old foster-mother accepts, in the *Aulularia*, the fate of her foster-child—and the burden of her own responsibility!—with such a melancholy resignation as we are by no means accustomed to meeting with her congeners in the New Comedy [6]). After Euclio's departure in verse 274 (before he goes he tells her that he has married off Phaedra to Megadorus)

1) Cf. pp. 33 f.

2) As Lyconides had to tell a secret intended for the audience it goes without saying that Megadorus went out previously. Whither? Probably to Eunomia in order first to discuss with her his marriage-plans for himself and for his son. This makes it perfectly clear that Plautus has employed her in his II 1 as an opposite number to Megadorus. In the Greek play Megadorus returned from his visit to her after the entr'acte and met Euclio (cf. verse 176).

3) The same disposition in the *Andria*, verses 205—225, which belonged to the first act of the Greek model. Vide *Gr. Orig.* pp. 99 ff.

4) Verses 60—66, 74 ff., 105—119.

5) Vide p. 22.

6) Vide *Epitrepontes* (Sophrone), *Adelphoi* (Canthara), *Georgos* (Philinna).

she remains on the stage, but only in order to speak a brief lament (274—279). She is wondering what she has to do, but she does not do anything [1]. At last she enters the house in order to wash up in view of the wedding, 'for she fears that she will get to drink an acid grief unalloyed' [2]. Her reasons are far from understandable, but it is clear that she is resigned and that, if she does anything at all, she helps on the wedding and does not do anything to obstruct it.

If we consider that in the original state of affairs Lyconides was alone in Megadorus' house when Staphyla remained alone on the stage at 274, and that Lyconides had no doubt heard ten verses previously how Megadorus called the slave Strobilus out of the house in order to go to market with him [3], then it may surely be expected that the young man came out of the house quickly so as to ascertain if possible what had meanwhile happened and what had been arranged. Therefore, after verse 277 a scene must have followed, in which Lyconides and Staphyla met; so that when he learned from her that Megadorus was already the chosen bridegroom (cf. verse 271) he could resolve in consultation with her to go and ask advice and assistance of his aunt Eunomia. This scene completed the 2nd act in the Greek play, and consequently this act was a good deal longer than the one hundred verses (176—279) which Plautus retained of it.

In the 3rd act Strobilus re-appeared on the stage, with the hired cooks [4]. What he did not know when he left in II he knows now: his old master wishes to marry again and the bride shall be his neighbour's daughter, and that before the end of the day. Strobilus accompanies the cook, who will have to cook the bridal meal, as far as Euclio's door and there he calls Staphyla out of the house. The cook's arrival shows Staphyla that the danger is imminent. Does it not follow that as soon as she saw how near at hand the wedding was, she requested Strobilus to go as soon as possible to tell

1) Verse 274. Quid ego nunc agam?
Nunc nobis prope adest exitium, mihi atque erili filiae.

2) Verse 278:
Ibo intro, ut erus quae inperavit, facta quom veniat sient.
Nam ecastor malum maerorem metuo, ne inmixtim bibam.

3) Verse 264.

4) Vide p. 34, note 3.

Lyconides? It seems to me that this is the logical conclusion of the situation. This then was the cause of Strobilus' disappearance [1]) and it is obvious now how Plautus has suppressed that cause, this was the motivation and the explanation of the rôle of Pythodicus, which is so enigmatical in Plautus' text [2]). For Strobilus — Lyconides' slave, but also Megadorus', instructed by the latter to superintend the cook and his helpers in his house — could not leave without deputing that task to a fellow slave. Therefore he called Pythodicus out of the house and deputed the supervision to him [3]). Plautus has retained of this little scene only so much as was serviceable and indispensable for his action, viz. seven verses of monologue by Pythodicus, who had come out of Megadorus' house, through which the attention of the audience was distracted from Strobilus, so that he could disappear unnoticed.

That Strobilus has returned in the 4th act of the Greek play is not only logical, but it appears from Plautus [4]), who had him retain his name although he changed his position. And no doubt Strobilus was there, just as in the *Aulularia,* Lyconides' forerunner and herald [5]), so that Lyconides appeared indeed shortly after him, accompanied by Eunomia, just as in Plautus' work [6]), and effected the dénouement by means of an anagnorisis, just as in Plautus' work. However, the dissimilarity was greater than the similarity. For it is clear that this recognition cannot have been a pseudo-anagnorisis, but only an effective discovery of concealed facts. What Plautus gives in verses 682—700 is not a scene of recognition, but a scene of revelation. Lyconides confesses the whole truth, which he has known for a long time. In the Greek play he only knew half of the truth, and that

1) Verse 362.

2) Vide pp. 41 ff., p. 52.

3) Apparently Pythodicus came out of Megadorus' house and also went into it again, as in Plautus' work in 363 and 370. Here, however, Pythodicus makes his appearance uninvited and motivates his entrance by means of a '*curate*' (363) added by Plautus and intended for the cooks in Megadorus' house. Dziatzko's version 'ego intervisam <hi> quid faciant coqui' is therefore unnecessary. Plautus' action is, of course, highly defective from a technical point of view, but by no means inconceivable to a spectator.

4) Verse 587.

5) Cf. pp. 31 f.

6) Verse 682.

half-truth had prevented him from declaring his love for Phaedra. He must have discovered by means of the anagnorisis that the unknown woman whose pledge tied him was no other than Phaedra herself. After what we have remarked before [1]) there can be no doubt but that this secret has come to light through the intermediary of Staphyla; she took, necessarily, an active part in the anagnorisis, as only she was able to recognize the pledge as Phaedra's property. But in my opinion the difference between Plautus' *'recognitio'* and its model is not restricted to this one point. The deepest, most hidden foundation on which the action of the Greek play was based has not yet been revealed. That there was still another secret in that play, by the side of and connected with that of Lyconides, appears from Eunomia's presence at the recognition. For if the fact discovered by Lyconides and Staphyla—his guilt and paternity—had been the only secret of the substruction, Eunomia's figure would have had no *raison d'être,* because her mediation with Megadorus, superfluous as it has become in Plautus' work because of his changes [2]), would have been even more superfluous in the Greek play. For Eunomia's task as a helper was understandable as long as she could go to her aged brother in order to dissuade him in all conscience from marrying the young Phaedra, out of sympathy with her young nephew and out of anxiety about his old father [3]). But at the moment when Lyconides discovered the origin of his pledge it became his duty and his right to speak to his father personally and point-blank. Therefore the anagnorisis deprived Eunomia of the basis of the task to perform which she had been fetched and had come.

What is the logical conclusion of this? Before drawing my final conclusion I wish to state four facts. Eunomia had a rôle in the Greek play. She had only a rôle in the recognition. Her task was an indispensable element of the action. That task was: mediation with Megadorus. The latter fact is beyond doubt because any other task is impossible for Megadorus' sister. The first-mentioned facts are established through Plautus and that on the following ground. The

1) Vide p. 25, pp. 55 f.
2) Cf. p. 23, pp. 75 ff.
3) Probably the idea was that she was to think it little advisable for Megadorus to marry a young woman with whom his son was in love.

task which he gives her is superfluous. Yet she has to act a part. Why? Simply because he found her in this place in the original. So she was created by the Greek poet and for that reason her rôle and task cannot have been superfluous. For although we can understand that the adapter keeps up a figure that has become superfluous, we could not understand that the original poet creates a superfluous figure. And now our final conclusion. In the Greek play Eunomia only found her real task through the anagnorisis at the moment that she lost the task motivating her entrance on the stage. Her rôle and her intervention will become clear if we assume that the γνώρισμα contained still another secret, which she could only discover and which she was only allowed to disclose to Megadorus, because it had to remain a secret between him and her. These two requirements gave the figure of the sister its *raison d'être,* and the nature of the secret can be gathered from the fact that it was inacceptable to Plautus, and therefore the most important reason why he deviated so much from his model as has been shown by our analysis. The ring, which Staphyla recognized as Phaedra's property, must at the same time have been recognized by Eunomia as Megadorus' former property. That discovery gave her a new and unexpected task, for which she was destined by the maker of the play, the only task, for which she was suitable. She had to speak to her brother privately about the possibility that Phaedra, whom he wished to marry, might be his own daughter. Consequently after the anagnorisis she sent Lyconides into the house in order to call her brother immediately. The scene of Lyconides, Eunomia and Staphyla—the anagnorisis proper—has been replaced by Plautus by verses 682—695. He made the recognition into a simple confession and replaced Staphyla's figure and rôle by Phaedra's call for '*mea nutrix*' and '*Juno Lucina*'. The delicate and confidential conversation after that, between sister and brother, has been expunged by him. Yet some trace of this conversation has been preserved in the *Aulularia.* For Plautus has employed the first part of it—though changed in accordance with his own requirements—in another place. It is to be found in the verses 120 ff., but there it is only Eunomia's timid beginning that testifies to the original nature of that conversation, which was the vital point of the plot in the 4th act of the Greek play, because it

immediately caused the marriage-agreement to be cancelled, and consequently the rape of the gold to be discovered [1]).

As we have pointed out the theme of the original of the *Aulularia* has undergone under Plautus' hand a no less fundamental transformation than proved to be the case with the *Rudens* [2]). The result of that fundamental change must have been a great number of changes of all kinds and degrees, directly and indirectly. By the side of these there is the fixed category of more or less extensive Plautinisms, which arose spontaneously from the poet's playful mind. It is not possible to discriminate those kinds rigorously in the following discussion; it is not desirable to enter into details too much where so many changes have been brought about. For this reason I prefer to divide the material into two groups, excisions and insertions, while I include the substitutions in the first group, and the rest of the changes in the second, and in general restrict myself to what seems to be important and extensive. For the reader's guidance I prefix a brief sketch of the original action such as I think it was. I have to apologize to the reader for being obliged to repeat some things that he already knows and to anticipate what will have to be repeated later on anew.

It is not difficult to point out the lines along which the Greek poet has developed his theme. The first act gave the exposition. It was contained in a scene of Euclio and Staphyla, as we find in verses 40—119 of Plautus' work, and in a scene of Megadorus and his son Lyconides, which has been replaced by Plautus. The dialogues were supplemented by monologues; Euclio monologized as in verses 60—66 and 105—119, Staphyla as in verses 67—78, and Lyconides after his conversation with Megadorus. An omniscient person, the Heros, revealed to the audience the secrets, which were unknown to the human characters, or disclosed those details which for whatever reason were kept a secret by them. Consequently the audience knew after the first act that the poor, mean Euclio kept a treasure hidden (verses 63, 65, 80, 110) and knew through the god how Euclio had found the treasure, and for what the god had

1) Vide p. 21.
2) Vide Kuiper, *Diph. i. d. Rud.*

destined it. The audience knew that Phaedra, Euclio's daughter, expected a child born out of wedlock (verses 74 ff.), and knew through the god who was the child's father. The audience knew that Megadorus would ask Euclio for his daughter's hand (verses 171 ff.) and knew through the god what great danger was involved in this. Finally the audience also knew why Lyconides could not confess his love of the girl to his father.

In the 2nd act Megadorus carried out his plan: he spoke to Euclio (verses 176 ff.). Next there came from the side of Staphyla a first attempt at preventing the arranged marriage, in order to achieve which she conspired with Lyconides (after verse 279), who went to Eunomia in order to ask for advice and assistance, i.e. to his father's sister, whose house was situated in the same neighbourhood, but rather far from the stage [1]).

The 3rd act aggravated the danger for all those concerned. The cook's arrival provided Staphyla with proof and certainty that the wedding was imminent. Therefore she had Strobilus tell Lyconides that he had to hurry. (After verse 362). But that was not the only function of the cook in the complication. This appeared at Euclio's return from the market (verse 371). The fact that Megadorus had sent that cook and his helpers to his house drove the suspicious [2]) miser to a frenzy. He no longer considered the treasure to be safe in his garden from the attacks of his neighbour and future son-in-law [3]), and conveyed his pot to the spot where he had found it, the heroion situated to the right of the stage.

At the beginning of the 4th act Strobilus returned home from his errand (cf. verse 587). Just when he had entered Megadorus' house, Euclio on returning passed his neighbour's door. By what he was saying to himself he betrayed to Strobilus his riches and the spot where the gold lay buried (cf. verses 608 ff.). Consequently Strobilus could go and discover the treasure, when Euclio had gone into his house in order to dress in view of the rite of the marriage-offering [4]). Immediately after Strobilus' exit Lyconides with Euno-

1) Vide p. 51, note 1. 2) Vide pp. 15 f.

3) Vide verses 462–464; p. 15, p. 18.

4) Verse 612. Nunc lavabo, ut rem divinam faciam, ne adfinem morer,
Quin ubi arcessat meam extemplo filiam ducat domum.

mia appeared from the left (cf. verse 682). In order to prove that there was a valid reason for his indecision he showed a ring with a remarkable ornament, his pledge. Eunomia recognized that ring as Megadorus' former property, but remained silent; but Staphyla, who on hearing Lyconides' voice had run out of the house, recognized it as Phaedra's property. Now Eunomia sent Lyconides into the house in order to tell Megadorus that she wished to speak to him outside (cf. verse 133). In this conversation she cautiously pointed out to her brother the possibility that he might be Phaedra's father, and showed him the ring. As he had to admit that that possibility really existed, his first deed after Eunomia's departure was to seek contact with Euclio and to cancel the marriage. But as he did not give any explanation, Euclio's suspicion was roused; urged by a malignant supposition that Megadorus' intention to steal the treasure had succeeded he rushed away to the right. Thus Megadorus had to re-enter his house and there his son Lyconides could tell him that he loved Phaedra and that it was his duty to marry her.

After Megadorus had left the stage Strobilus appeared with the stolen pot, which he wished to conceal in the house, i.e. in Megadorus' house [1]), (cf. verses 701—711). But hardly had he entered when he came outside again, with Lyconides, who gave him the message for Staphyla, that Megadorus renounced the marriage (cf. verse 815). From sheer necessity Strobilus carried the stolen pot to the miser's house, while Lyconides re-entered his own house. Immedia-

1) He wished to conceal the treasure where he was at home himself. He wishes the same thing in Plautus' play and in fact he acted accordingly, as appears from verse 712 (*ego ibo, ut hoc condam domum*) and from verse 823 (*—ubi id est aurum? —in arca apud me.*). Plautus' means by this: 'Eunomia's house', which is situated outside the stage (vide p. 51 note 1), for that is where the Strobilus of this part of the *Aulularia* lives. He who has understood that Eunomia does not live with Megadorus in the Latin play either, cannot interpret verse 712 as if it meant: 'to Megadorus' house'. It may be asked why Strobilus enters the stage carrying the stolen gold (Dziatzko p. 263, Krieger pp. 82 f.). Plautus had three very valid reasons for this: first, because he entered the stage in the original; secondly because the audience ought to know that his theft had been successful; thirdly because Plautus had every right to imagine that the nearest way from Silvanus to Eunomia's house led along the stage. Pressler, *De Pl. Aul.*, and Legrand p. 364 give evidence of a better insight than Dziatzko and Krieger.

tely afterwards the wailing Euclio appeared (verse 713); his wailing caused Lyconides to come out of the house (verse 727). A mutual misunderstanding provided Lyconides with the knowledge that Euclio was a rich man, although for the moment his treasure had been stolen. That rich man had him swear that he did not have the treasure, that he did not know anything of the theft, that he would not require a reward if he should find the thief and that he would not ask for lenient treatment for the thief; after that the young man was allowed to confess what he had on his mind. But Euclio did not reply to his proposal and disappeared into the house (verse 801), because he wanted to make sure that he was not being deceived[1]. His anger was great, but his incredulity was greater. And Staphyla would be able to give him that certainty[2]. Consequently Lyconides could for the moment go home again and tell his father how matters were. With his exit the 4th act came to an end.

Regarding the 5th act we cannot say very much with any certainty, because the Latin adaptation of the conclusion has got lost except 25 lines (verses 808—833). On the ground of the situation it is certain that Lyconides and Strobilus met, that Euclio appeared anew, found his gold again as a result of Lyconides' interference, gave his daughter to him and a dowry to his daughter. That that which has been enumerated here also took place in Plautus' play appears from the 25 verses that have been preserved, from the fragments of the lost conclusion and from the two *argumenta metrica.* But the question how many scenes of the *Aulularia* have got lost and what was the course of the action is a matter of guess-work. A fortiori this applies to the Greek play, whose 5th act is to be reconstructed from the data of the first four acts. I will reserve my surmises regarding these points till I have come to the end of my investigation, and accordingly I will not now try to settle the point whether Plautus' incomplete scene (verses 808 ff.) is in conformity with V 1 of the original. First it is necessary to discuss in detail the alterations made in I to IV. In doing so we shall have to find in Plautus' own text and action the traces showing that he has expunged and replaced and added. This will at the same time give the corrob-

1) Vide p. 56, note 1; p. 84.
2) Vide pp. 55 f., p. 69.

oration, I hope, of much that may seem not to have been proved conclusively by our former inferences.

As we have said above Plautus must have expunged a scene of Megadorus and Lyconides in the exposition. If actually in the original play Lyconides was Megadorus' son and unknown rival and also his housemate, then that scene was as it were dictated by the situation. A widower who has his adult son living in his house as his only child wishes to marry again. To whom is he more likely to reveal his intention than to his son? Moreover, in accordance with the relations obtaining in Comedy, he will also intimate to him that he himself should also marry now and settle elsewhere [1]. Those are two plans, which the Greek Megadorus entertained. On this ground I called it very probable that after the end of the conversation he made his exit from the left of the stage in order to speak to his sister Eunomia about the two plans [2].

Plautus has replaced the expunged scene by a dialogue of Megadorus and Eunomia. This dialogue betrays the hand of the adapter and is therefore characterized as a substitute. The only fact it mentions is that Megadorus wishes to become engaged to Phaedra, i.e. that which we read in verses 172—173, which form the gist of lines 170—175. To this Eunomia's so-called advice is prefixed, which Megadorus refuses to accept, first while uttering droll gibes about the holy estate of matrimony and next while putting forward wrongly applied commonplaces (verses 147b—168) [3]. The jokes about the non-existence of good women, in 135—143 [4], are in the same spirit and style as 147b—168 and form an interlude between the solemn commencement in 120—134 and the indispensable question and explanation concerning the meaning of Eunomia's visit, in 144—147a. Those verses (120—134, 144—147a) are certainly authentic, but they do not belong in this place. The solemn timidity of Eunomia's commencement (verses 120—134) is utterly incon-

1) Cf. Plaut. *Epidicus* verses 190, 361.
2) Vide p. 62, note 2.
3) Vide about verse 164: p. 53.
4) Vide Krieger p. 18, who calls verses 124—126 'Plautine' besides 136—142, and 150—164 suspect.

gruent with her good-natured meaning; and her assurance 'id monitum a d v e n t o', the answer to the question 'quid est, quod v e n i s' [1]), clashes with the action supposed by Plautus. I have pointed this out previously [2]). I shall discuss verses 120—134 along with the 4th act, because only there can it appear in what connection they are really suitable.

Of the second of the scenes expunged by Plautus, viz. the conversation between Lyconides and Staphyla, not a trace has been preserved in his text. Yet the two must have spoken to each other. I should place their scene before Lyconides' departure to his aunt Eunomia. That he went to her in one of the first acts of the Greek play cannot be doubted by any one. For his dwelling-place was on the stage, and when he entered the stage in the 4th act he came from outside the stage, accompanied by Eunomia. Consequently the question is only whether he had gone to her at the end of I, after his conversation with Megadorus, or at the end of II. In my opinion the former possibility has to be ruled out, because his father's plan, as long as it was a mere plan, did not call for immediate action on Lyconides' part; and besides it is probable that at the end of I Megadorus himself went to Eunomia [3]). But in the latter part of II the father's action justified a counteraction on the son's part; further there was an opportunity there, the coast was clear, because the old man went to the market, soon followed by Euclio. However, an indispensable preparation for this 'counter-offensive' was a meeting between Lyconides and Staphyla. In their secret opposition to Megadorus' marriage they were each other's natural allies. And who except Staphyla was able to tell Lyconides that the engagement had already been contracted and that the wedding was to follow immediately? [4]).

Although in the words themselves of Plautus' *Nutrix* (verses 274—279) there is nothing that suggests the expunction of a scene, yet the traces of amputation are not lacking. This refers to the incredible meekness of this foster-mother and to the singular

1) Verses 147, 144. Vide p. 52, note 2, p. 53, note 1.
2) Vide pp. 52 f.
3) Vide p. 62, note 2, p. 71.
4) Cf. verse 271.

motivation of her exit (verse 279), of which I made mention above[1]. However, it seems to me that above all the fact that Euclio starts before he has seen her enter the house gives a clear indication as to Staphyla's function according to the Greek poet. Compare Euclio's departure from home in 103 ff. with his departure in verses 268—274. In 103 he does not go away before he has heard Staphyla bolt the door; '*occlude sis fores ambobus pessulis*' he calls out to her, after she has entered, and it takes up 15 more verses before he is really gone. But in verse 268 he makes her come out of the house without any necessity—for she could just as well hear his commands if she stayed in the house—and then leaves her behind at the open door. It is true he says '*tace atque abi....,* *aedis occlude*', but he does not make sure whether his command is carried out. The contrast to the action in verses 103 ff. is so striking that the idea of chance is excluded. But if the Greek poet left Staphyla on the stage on purpose, this must have been because he wished to mix her up in a following scene[2]. That Lyconides played the opposite number to her there is beyond doubt, for no one else was present.

The 3rd of the passages expunged by Plautus occurred between verse 362 and verse 363. Suffice it to repeat here briefly what I have said above[3]. At this point of Plautus' action there is a gap, which appears from the abrupt disappearance of Strobilus and from Pythodicus' appearance without any preparation and explanation. Consequently it seems that two little scenes have been expunged, one in which Staphyla requested Strobilus, after verse 362, to inform Lyconides in hot haste that he had to hurry, and one in which Strobilus gave his orders to Pythodicus. So Strobilus before going away went back home, called Pythodicus out of the house and passed on his task of supervision to him. If we insert these two brief scenes, the action becomes perfectly lucid, while at the same time it is clear how by the excision of this fragment the hitch in Strobilus'

1) Vide p. 22, pp. 62 f.

2) He who thinks that the function of Staphyla's monologue was to cover Strobilus' absence forgets that the original had entr'acte before verse 280. Vide p. 29 f.

3) Vide pp. 41 ff., p. 64.

rôle arose, which Plautus enhanced in the second part of the play. We shall return to this when discussing his additions [1]).

The following case of excision lies between verses 681 and 701. Here an extensive anagnorisis-complex has been replaced by a so-called *recognitio,* a brief pseudo-anagnorisis, which through its form, its actual contents and its tendency betrays the hand of the adapter [2]). As far as form goes it is the simple communication of a fact which has been known to the speaker for many months, and which contains nothing to surprise the audience. The fact, Lyconides' offence and paternity, is confirmed, on behalf of Eunomia, by the cry of Phaedra in travail. And the idea of all this is to present the lover to the audience, and to give Eunomia a task which justifies her appearance anyhow. When Plautus' Lyconides enters the stage he has made his confession, and states this in the dialogue. To whom does he confide his secret? To Eunomia, and to Eunomia only. She has no doubt a right to learn it; but even in Plautus' work, where she is Lyconides' mother, she yet has not the first right—not from a dramatic point of view either—and certainly not an exclusive right. For Staphyla deserves to be told the secret more than anyone else, both as Phaedra's representative and for her own sake. She is the only person in the play who knows of the existence of a secret, she has been tortured by it for many months and on the most crucial day of her life she cannot think of anything else. And yet the disclosure is withheld from her. But 120 verses further on Lyconides declares that she knows everything (verse 807). Consequently, clashing badly with Plautus' own action it appears there, as a result of his carelessness, that in the Greek play the requirements of justice, dramatic art and logic were met. The old fostermother obtained her share in the disclosure.

It need not be asked in which phase of the play this happened. An anagnorisis-scene was the proper place for disclosures like this one. This very fact shows that Staphyla has been present at the dialogue between Lyconides and Eunomia down from a certain moment. However, she was more than a silent witness. Due to Staphyla's presence the dialogue became a scene of recognition, so

1) Vide pp. 96 ff.
2) Compare pp. 55 ff. for what follows.

that her presence can be proved from her indispensability. Her prodit had—as I have said above—a valid motive, as she was keyed up for Lyconides to return [1]; her participation was necessary for the anagnorisis. For the recognition in the Greek play brought to light a secret that nobody knew [2], it was a real discovery, such as may be seen to be made when two people, each partly ignorant, complete each other's knowledge and thus find the whole of the truth. In our case Lyconides and Staphyla were two such people. As Phaedra herself was not allowed to appear, the foster-mother was the only person who knew exactly that which was lacking in the lover's knowledge [3]. However, the unwritten law of the New Attic Comedy required a tangible exhibit as something indispensable, if the perpetrator of a nocturnal assault made in drunkenness was to be recognized and identified with complete certainty, and therefore there must have been an exhibit here, too. Thus the surmise that Lyconides possessed a pledge, is corroborated and borne out by what we know as an established tradition from a series of comedies [4], where an ornament or a ring always leads to the recognition. This pledge had a double function in the model of the *Aulularia,* because it helped on the complication and solved it. It was the cause of Lyconides' silence and it remained an obstacle until Staphyla saw and recognized it when he showed it to Eunomia [5].

Eunomia's function in the scene of recognition has come in for brief mention above; in this place I will set forth my opinion in detail. In the 4th act of Plautus' work she has a rôle which, to put it mildly, is nonsensical, the task of an intercessor in a matter which is not and cannot be a dilemma, however much she may try to suggest by her words that Megadorus is sure to yield only to her urgent request [6]. She is going to ask him whether he is willing to give up Phaedra, her reason for this humble request being that Phaedra

1) Lyconides and Eunomia entered the stage coming from the left, so that they passed Euclio's house while talking. Vide p. 51, note 1, pp. 38 f.
2) Vide Kuiper, *Gr. Orig.* p. 273, under Anagnorisis.
3) Vide pp. 53 ff.
4) E.g. *Hekyra, Synaristosai, Adelphoi, Epitrepontes, Heros.*
5) Compare the rôle of Onesimos in the *Epitrepontes,* verses 174 ff. J.
6) Verse 687. Et istuc confido a fratre me inpetrassere.

has become a mother by Megadorus' nephew Lyconides. The 'ancients' were queer people, but still we should be inclined to say that this very fact, no matter by whom or in what way it was communicated to Megadorus, was more than enough to make him change his mind. If this were not so, he would either have to be silly or so madly in love with Phaedra that in order to possess her he was prepared to fly in the teeth of law and morals. But Megadorus is neither silly nor madly in love. On the contrary, he is a most sensible and respectable man, who was led by reason in making his choice [1]. The sisterly argument, which Eunomia has prepared, is utterly unimaginable. One thing only can be easily imagined: that Plautus has no room on the stage for this interview between brother and sister.

If in the original play Eunomia came along as an intercessor in order to ask her brother to give up his intended marriage on behalf of Lyconides, simply because the boy loved the girl, then her arrival was justified and she had a task for which she was perfectly suited as the motherless boy's aunt and as Megadorus' sister. But this task was no longer justifiable as soon as the recognition made it obvious that law and morality interdicted the old man's marriage and that they might safely let him know. This made Eunomia's intercession superfluous. There cannot be any doubt, I think, that this course of events was the Greek poet's design. He would not have made Eunomia appear on the stage, which in this case means he would not have created Eunomia [2], if he had not had a real rôle for her. Consequently the task, which she lost through the anagnorisis, had only seemingly been her task, and that very anagnorisis furnished her with her real task. That she was thus made the instrument to prevent Megadorus' marriage is evident. No other function is possible for her in the play. And it is likewise evident that Lyconides' rape of Phaedra had nothing to do with Eunomia's function, for it could not justify her action. For that reason it should be supposed that she recognized Phaedra's ring as Megadorus' former property, which gave rise to her anxiety and made her suspect that it might be

1) Vide verses 475 ff.

2) In my opinion it is out of the question that she is an original creation of Plautus. Cf. p. 66.

possible that Phaedra was only seemingly the miser's daughter and in reality Megadorus' daughter. If this was the kernel of the theme of the recognition, Plautus was obliged to replace this anagnorisis, because it was based [1]) on the *homopatrioi-motif*, of which he also got rid in the *Epidicus*, the *Rudens*, the *Cistellaria* and the *Bacchides* [2]). On that account, as we shall presently see, he broke, exactly at the culminating-point of the plot, the causal connection that linked the two subjects, marriage and theft, together [3]). And at the same time he has shortened Megadorus' rôle and deformed his figure. In Plautus' work bad luck made the good Megadorus into a disappointed bridegroom, the victim of the Lar and of his dear nephew. It is true this is comical, but it is not Comedy. In the Greek play he must have blessed his good luck, full of gratitude.

Therefore, after the scene of recognition, which in Plautus' work is represented by a substitute, there followed three scenes that were closely connected with it, a brief soliloquy of Eunomia, a dialogue between her and Megadorus, and a conversation between him and Euclio, which scenes Plautus has flatly cut out. In a few verses of monologue Eunomia made it clear to herself and her audience what she really suspected, until Megadorus came out of the house, having been informed by Lyconides, that she wished to speak to him at once. The interview between brother and sister, expunged in this place by Plautus, has been partly preserved in another place. I think it very probable that Plautus has employed the opening for Eunomia's notorious beginning in the canticum II 1 [4]). As I have remarked previously, it appears from verse 145 that—contrary to what is implied by Plautus' action—Eunomia has not been in Megadorus' house for a considerable time, but arrives just now [5]). And further the solemn timidity of her commencement—if the reader allows me to repeat this, too—is incompatible with her jovial advice. It is her duty as a sister, she declares, which compels her to speak; what

1) There was no absolute certainty regarding Megadorus' paternity, nor could it be obtained, as Phaedra's mother was dead.

2) Vide Kuiper, *Gr. Orig.* pp. 187 ff., p. 203, p. 239, *Diph. i. d. Rud.* p. 30 ff.

3) Vide p. 21.

4) Verses 120—134: Velim te arbitrari med haec verba, frater, e.q.s.

5) Verse 145 'advento', vide p. 53, and about 'venis' (verse 147) p. 52, note 2.

she is going to tell him may perhaps be called piffling women's talk and back-biting, but still she must not, for fear of how he may qualify her communication, keep that a secret from him which she thinks he ought to know. And for their conservation she has chosen a place where no one will be able to overhear them [1]. He who reads this commencement is bound to feel that she has come to tell Megadorus a very delicate secret newly discovered, which concerns him personally, and is important for him, but far from pleasant. It is evident that all this fits in beautifully with the situation in which the discovery of the ring had placed Eunomia, and with the delicate task thus imposed on her with regard to her brother. Although in Plautus' lyrical adaptation [2] a single word speaks of 'advice', yet with him, too, 'admonition' is predominant [3], and the whole passage shows clearly enough that, in the scene of which it once formed a part, Eunomia was going to 'disclose' something to Megadorus and admonish him to be careful. Having fulfilled this task she no doubt went back again. This leave-taking is to be found in *Aulularia* verses 175—176. Plautus has not utilized it anew in the 4th act. When at verse 695 of his 'recognition' he had piloted Eunomia into the house, he did not see his way clear to get her out of the house again. But that mattered nothing to him; she might wait there until Lyconides was engaged and married.

The last scene of the expunged anagnorisis-complex was between Megadorus and Euclio. He could not possibly keep his promise of marriage to Euclio, and was in duty bound to send him word immediately [4]. Where was Euclio at that moment? In his house. Probably, however, there was even no need for Megadorus to look for him or call him. For according to verse 612 Euclio had gone

1) Verses 120—121 meai fidei causa, 123—124 nos odiosas haberi, multum loquaces merito omnes habemur, 131 neque occultum id haberi neque per metum mussari, 133 eo nunc ego secreto foras te huc seduxi.

2) Jachmann (p. 141) remarks that Plautus 'den Ton des Gesprächs zwischen Eunomia und Megadorus gründlich verstimmt hat'. Quite so, the song is out of keeping, but not because the tone is false, but because the song is not suited for the occasion.

3) Verse 130 *'consulere'*, but by its side *'monere'*.

4) Vide p. 22, p. 83.

home in order to dress for his marriage-offering [1]. We should not attach any value to the fact that in the *Aulularia* his absence in the house is of very short duration only, since he comes out of the house again in verse 624, because he has to frustrate the theft in the Fides-temple, and then leaves for Silvanus carrying his treasure. For the whole of this episode (verses 624—681) is Plautus' own work; this has repeatedly been shown before, and will appear from new arguments hereafter. If we think away this episode, the old action becomes visible. We state that during the scenes of recognition Euclio was occupied in the house and that he could afterwards appear on the stage dressed for the offering. For it goes without saying that this offering was to be made on the altar in front of the house. Such an altar was never absent on any stage, and Plautus mentions it in verse 606. Consequently the prodit of Euclio was obvious; the situation shows what was to follow. At the very moment that in his festive attire he was going to ask the gods' blessing on the marriage, and was waiting for the bridegroom to arrive [2], the bridegroom approached him and went back on his word.

This cancellation must have had the form of an expression of regret without giving a reason. For Megadorus could not mention the reason why he had changed his mind [3]. And this means that, having been asked for an explanation, he made no answer, and that Euclio, at once suspicious, could not but guess a secret and suspect motive. Now he had from the first misjudged the purity of his neighbour's intentions [4], at first thinking that he wished to secure the treasure through the marriage, and afterwards even supposing that he had wished the cook to steal it for him. He could not but

1) Verse 612:
E u c l. Nunc lavabo, ut rem divinam faciam, ne adfinem morer,
Quin ubi arcessat meam extemplo filiam ducat domum.

2) See preceeding note and cf. verse 579. It follows that Megadorus also wore a festive attire.

3) Why he did not give Phaedra's pregnancy and Lyconides' violation as a reason? Because he did not yet know anything of it. For Euclio had to remain ignorant of his daughter's pregnancy till within the scene 727—807. Consequently the poet saw to it that Lyconides lacked time and opportunity to confess his sin to his father immediately after the discovery, and that Eunomia avoided this subject because it was not her business.

4) Vide p. 15 (notes 3 and 4)., p. 68.

connect the unexplained breach of promise of marriage with his treasure and could not but believe that it had been stolen, no matter whether by Megadorus himself or by an accomplice of his. He was sure that Megadorus had now reached his end and therefore suddenly cancelled the marriage, which had never been anything else to him but a means to an end at best. The first and only thing for Euclio to do, his automatic reaction, was to rush immediately to the heroion in order to make sure whether his supposition was correct. Therefore he left Megadorus where he was and the only thing for the latter to do was to go into his house again, after a brief after-consideration. There was food enough for after-consideration: himself, Eunomia, Phaedra and the meaning of the sudden departure of the annoyed Euclio [1]).

On this point, at verse 701, Plautus returns for a while to the original action, but at verse 712 he changes it anew. The verses 701—704 and 709—711 contain exactly the quintessence of what Strobilus said in the Greek play when he showed his booty to the audience [2]). He had escaped by the skin of his teeth on his way back, he tells the audience, but fortunately he had seen the miser come on in time and evaded him. Then Plautus' Strobilus is aware of danger again in verse 712 [3]). For Euclio has by now discovered that he has been robbed, and returns to the stage. Consequently Strobilus hurries away. He is going to conceal his booty 'in his house', by

1) As Euclio ran away so angrily and hastily in the direction of the town, Megadorus very probably thought that he wished to lodge a complaint. Cf. Beauchet, *Hist. du droit privé d. l. Rép. Athén.* I p. 130.

2) Fraenkel (p. 75) calls verses 701 ff.: 'den frei erfunden Anfang des Sklavenmonologs', which is an unproved assertion, for he leaves form and contents unexplained, whereas we might expect to learn from Fraenkel to what animals in charge of a treasure, of Latin invention (*pici*? *pices*?), Plautus alludes. Thomas, *Pl. Aul.* Notes, considers p i c i s to be the acc. plur. of p i x = Boeot. φίξ = σφίγξ, and Fleckeisen (Jahrb. 1891, 657 ff.) holds the same opinion. Thomas' conclusion is: 'It is a natural surmise that γρύπας stood here in the Greek original of Plautus'. Francken, *Pl. Aul.* ad loc., arrives at the same conclusion though along a different line of thought, and he refers to Herod. 3, 116; 4, 13 (Stein), Pomp. Mela II 1, and others. It is natural to assume that Plautus has mixed up *sphinges* and *grypes*, as occurs elsewhere, too.

Verses 705—708 are a continuation of 678—679 and consequently of Plautus' hand.

3) Verse 712. Attat: eccum ipsum: ego ibo, ut hoc condam domum.

which the slave of Plautus' *Aulularia* means: in Eunomia's house [1]. Here we find the traces of an excision anew, and now for the last time. Verse 712 is a substitute for a brief scene between Strobilus and Lyconides.

I think that this can be proved on two grounds. In the first place we hear in verse 815 that Strobilus returns from an errand to Staphyla: Lyconides had sent him thither [2]. In Plautus' *Aulularia* that order is absent; Lyconides does not give that instruction and cannot give it, as he does not get any contact with his slave, neither outside nor inside the house. Verse 815 alludes to a contact which Plautus has expunged; careless as he is he keeps the allusion to the expunged scene. There are two places in the action where there is an opportunity for that contact, immediately before verse 713 and immediately after verse 807, at the end of the 4th act. The last-named possibility, however, is practically out of the question, and the proof of this shows, not only indirectly but also directly, that the scene expunged occurred between verse 711 and 713. Plautus' Strobilus wishes to hide his booty in the house (verse 712). Strobilus no doubt wished the same thing in the original, and there it meant: in Megadorus' house. That he should choose his master's house for this was only natural, but it is as natural that the Greek poet had to find a means to stop Strobilus in this intention. For if the gold should have been hidden in Megadorus' house, then the discovery would make Megadorus the culprit and Euclio's obstinate suspicion would appear to be justified. If at long last the miser should perhaps allow himself to be persuaded that, contrary to what seemed to be the truth, Megadorus was innocent, this could only happen at the expense of the real thief, Strobilus. But it may be called inconceivable that in the last act of the play, after verse 807, so complicated a case should be posed and developed, and also that Strobilus should be punished as a vile thief in the end. It follows that he has not hidden his booty in Megadorus' house, i.e. that he did not get the

1) Vide p. 69, note 1.

2) Dziatzko (p. 263) thinks that Strobilus comes out of Megadorus' house at verse 808; he accepts the consequence of his opinion and deletes verse 815 as an interpolation (p. 265, note 1). Krieger (p. 84) holds the same opinion as Dziatzko, but backs out of the consequence by asserting that in 815 Lyconides does not make a proper use of his eyes!

opportunity and this in its turn implies that he was not sent to Staphyla after a hundred verses' undisturbed rest in Megadorus' house [1]), but immediately before 713. It is easy to reconstruct the action on this point, the contents of the scene expunged. It need only be considered that during Strobilus' soliloquy (verses 701 ff.) Lyconides was in the house with Megadorus, which in the context of the original action means that after his confession he received his father's blessing on his future alliance with Phaedra. This then gave him a double task: to await Euclio's return and to inform Staphyla at once that Megadorus had renounced the marriage. In order to give Strobilus that message for Staphyla, Lyconides accosted him at the very moment he wished to steal into the house, and immediately sent him to Euclio's house. In a brief monologue he gave vent to his feelings of joy and of heaviness of heart and next entered his house again in order to wait there till Euclio should return [2]). Thus from sheer necessity Strobilus carried the stolen pot of gold into the house of its owner [3]).

In the Greek play the expunged conversation between Lyconides and Strobilus was the 8th scene of the 4th act. The 9th, which in Plautus' work is also called IV 9, brought Euclio back to the stage as a picture of grief and frenzy due to lost riches (verses 713—726). His wailing made Lyconides come out of the house, just as we find this in Plautus (verse 727). The Latin play gives the action and the situation unchanged. It should be remembered that in the Greek play, where he entered the stage from the right, Euclio had already passed Megadorus' house before Lyconides came out of the front-door. Consequently, having recognized [4]) Euclio at that distance, Lyco-

1) Verses 713—807.

2) Cp. p. 80, note 1.

3) In the original play this turn was the basis of the final act of the history of the theft. Plautus could not copy that conclusion for a reason that will appear later on (vide p. 126). Therefore he was compelled to delete the scene where Strobilus was sent to Euclio's house.

4) At the opening of the scene the actors stand wide apart, which appears from verse 730: 'abeam an maneam, an adeam, an fugiam'. Therefore it is most natural that in 728 Lyconides says: 'atque hic quidem Euclio est, ut opinor'. This 'ut opinor' is not a parallel of verse 619, as Krieger (p. 75) thinks. (Vide p. 42, note 4). In 728 it expresses the slight doubt of a person who has to strain his eyes. The verse is certainly authentic.

nides might easily imagine that the old man, having returned home unexpectedly soon, had discovered what was the matter with his daughter. In this scene Plautus has not made any cuts, but he did make a few alterations and additions, which may easily be restored. The supposition that the miser does not know Lyconides is Plautus' invention, for in the Greek model they were neighbours. That supposition makes itself strongly felt in verses 777 ff., where Lyconides is compelled to introduce himself suddenly to the miser, whereupon he mentions the names of his parents and continues to say 'that Euclio has a daughter who is engaged to Megadorus', after which he gives him his uncle's greetings adding that the latter renounces the marriage [1]). In this comical and caddish way (but Plautus does not seem to have been aware of the coarse farce) the Latin poet makes up for the scene between Megadorus and Euclio, which he had expunged before verse 701. Consequently verses 777b—787a are to be considered as his insertion, so that there is a gain of ten verses as far as size goes. But overagainst this there is a loss which cannot be expressed in figures; the essential feature of the original has been removed. The Greek miser suspected his rich neighbour,

1) Verses 777b—787a:

Lycon. Si me novisti minus,
Genere quo sim gnatus: hic mihist Megadorus avonculus:
Meus fuit pater hinc Antimachus, ego vocor Lyconides:
Mater est Eunomia.
Eucl. Novi genus: nunc quid vis? id volo
Noscere.
Lycon. Audi: filiam ex te tu habes.
Eucl. Immo eccillam domi.
Lycon. Eam tu despondisti, opinor, meo avonculo.
Eucl. Omnem rem tenes.
Lycon. Is me nunc renuntiare repudium iussit tibi.
Eucl. Repudium rebus paratis exornatis nuptiis?
Ut illum di inmortales omnes deaeque quantumst perduint,
Quem propter hodie auri tantum perdidi infelix miser.
Lycon. Bono animo's, benedice.

Krieger (p. 75) considers verses 777—780 to be the official formula for every engagement: 'Nam haec sententia in sponsione usurpari solet, cf. Aul. 216 (Meg.): *Dic mihi, quali me arbitrare genere prognatum*'. By means of this so-called 'parallel' he tries to prove that Plautus' Euclio has known Lyconides for many years. He who believes this will perhaps also agree with Krieger that words like 731 ff. are only spoken among old acquaintances (p. 75).

Megadorus, of the theft of his gold. Therefore he made Megadorus' son swear that he did not have the gold, that he did not know who had it, that he would mention the thief if he discovered him, that he would not try to save him, and that he would not demand any reward for himself (772—776). The Latin Euclio makes a young man swear that oath, who is a perfect stranger to him at the moment. Therefore Euclio's stipulation loses its meaning and becomes absurd [1]).

Further we have to ascribe to Plautus the places where it says that Phaedra is in child-bed. For Plautus had changed her pregnancy into labour for the sake of his action. Consequently the '*peperisse*' of verse 729 is his. And the verses 796—800a, too, have been entirely inserted by Plautus [2]). Their kernel has been discussed earlier [3]). On account of the impudent tone of jocular bravura they clash utterly with the feelings of an Attic young man, who having violated a citizen's daughter asks her father's forgiveness and is anxiously waiting to know whether he will be prepared to accept him as a son-in-law in accordance with the stipulation of the law [4]). Plautus has arranged the conclusion of the scene (verses 802b—807) in such a way that he provided Lyconides with a kind of

1) Vide p. 56, note 1.

2) Verses 796—800a:

E u c l. Ei mihi, quod ego facinus ex ted audio?
L y c o n. Cur eiulas,
Quem ego avom feci iam ut esses filiai nuptiis?
Nam tua gnata peperit decumo mense post: numerum cape.
Ea re repudium remisit avonculus causa mea.
I intro, exquaere, sitne ita ut ego praedico.

3) Verses 796b—798, vide pp. 57 f.

4) Verse 793. Ut mihi ignoscas eamque uxorem mihi des, ut leges iubent. The evidence regarding the punishment levied for violation by the Attic law is not uniform. Vide Beauchet, *Hist. du droit privé d.l. Rép. Athén.* I pp. 138 f. It is dubious whether Hermogenes (π. στάσ. 10, p. 59 W) mentions the written law when he says that the injured party could decide whether a marriage should be admitted or capital punishment should be demanded. For other sources mention a fine. However, it is obvious that Comedy was apt to utilize a duty to marry as prescribed by law (without a dowry). Cf. Ter. *Ad.* verses 724 ff., *Andr.* verse 780. By the side of this—and this is very important for an estimation of Lyconides' feelings—Comedy also takes into consideration the right of the injured party to be revenged on the culprit by the imposition of an extremely heavy penalty. This appears from Menander's *Fabula Incerta.*

motive to stay where he was, thus bridging over the last entr'acte [1]). In the Greek play Lyconides went back into the house here. Had he not to tell his father how matters were and what he had discovered: that Euclio was a rich man and had been robbed? Uncle Megadorus would hardly be interested in this.

A rough estimate of the extent of the nine cuts described above is not entirely impossible. The Greek scene I 3, of Megadorus and Lyconides, will probably have been as long as the scene Eunomia-Megadorus, which Plautus (verses 120—175) gives as a substitute, rather shorter than longer; the Greek II 3, of Staphyla and Lyconides, may be put at the same extent; the Greek III 3 and III 4, the dialogues between Staphyla and Strobilus and between Strobilus and Pythodicus, were no doubt brief; the anagnorisis (Greek IV 3) together with Eunomia's soliloquy (Gr. IV 4) must have been a good deal longer than Plautus' scenelet IV 7 (verses 682—700); what followed, the conversation between Eunomia and Megadorus (Gr. IV 5), was a rather extensive scene if we measure it in accordance with the plan and method that are in evidence in the verses 120—134 of Plautus' work; the scene Megadorus-Euclio (Gr. IV 6) was no doubt brief, but was lengthened by Megadorus' monologue on his exit; the same holds good for the Greek IV 8, Lyconides' conversation with Strobilus followed by the former's monologue. If we estimate the number of verses in I 3 and II 3 together as 90 verses, those in III 3 and III 4 together as 15, those in IV 3, 4 and 5 together as 100, and those in IV 6 and IV 8 as 10 each, then we have to rate the total of Plautus' cuts at 225 verses. He has made up for 75 of these by his scenes II 1 and IV 7. Consequently, if he did not wish to curtail the extent of the comedy too much, it is probable that he has inserted some 150 verses in the first 4 acts.

One addition to that part has already been pointed out by Fraenkel [2]), viz. the verses 494—533. They form the long passage about the extravagant luxury of women, a piece which is full of Latinisms and in which the Greek terms for artisans and articles of luxury

1) Vide p. 33, p. 97.
2) Fraenkel p. 137. Vide supra p. 7, note 2, p. 20, note 1.

furnish as little proof of a Greek origin as a piece of English would do of French origin by containing the words 'passage', 'artisan' and 'luxury'. A passage like this is definitely out of place in the rural comedy used as a model by Plautus; it may be removed without damaging the context. Not far before it there is a dialogue which is to be considered as inserted, by virtue of the unwarranted action, viz. the dialogue between Euclio and the cook Congrio, verses 415—448. Euclio has returned from the market (371), where he has only bought some wreaths and a little incense to be offered to the Lar [1]), an offering which in the Greek play was obviously destined for the Heros, whose riches had been appropriated by Euclio. As he is approaching his house he hears a loud noise there, the door is flung wide and a voice is heard asking loudly for a 'pot' (390). Filled with fright he rushes into the house and, in order to fill the stage which has become empty, Anthrax, the other cook, comes out of Megadorus' house at that moment, instructs his helpers within what they have to do, and says that he is going to borrow a bread-tin from Congrio (398—402). He does not go far, for suddenly Bedlam seems to have been let loose in Euclio's house, and this frightens Anthrax so much that he goes back (403—405). At the same moment Congrio comes out of Euclio's house with his helpers. He is flying from the house, but his flight takes place in the style of tragedy. In a loud voice and with pathetic emotion he recites the stately long trochees, in which he conjures the citizens of Attica, the denizens and the foreigners to make ample way for his flight, now that he and his disciples are cudgelled out of the house [2]). Then he sees Euclio approaching. He knows what he has to do: he rushes away [3]). 'Der Koch hat seine Schuldigkeit getan, der Koch kann gehn'. Congrio had fulfilled his task in the complication. His presence, which was something unexpected, had to make Euclio think that Megadorus had sent the fellow to his house in order to

1) Verses 385—387. See on Krieger (p. 42): p. 13, note 4, and on Bierma (p. 130): p. 10, note 1.

2) Verse 409 *me miserum et meos discipulos,* verse 414 (412) *omnis... me atque hosce.*

3) The order of the verses which has come down to us is changed by most critics, so that verse 412 comes at the end.

steal the treasure [1]. Therefore this was a proof for Euclio that Megadorus knew that he kept a treasure hidden and in what place. This explains why, as soon as the cook and his helpers are outside, he digs up the pot in order to go and hide it elsewhere. After that, even if Congrio's presence in the house should be harmless, it was no longer necessary. As I have said he has performed his task, and if he runs away there is certainly not any reason to call him back [2]. The way in which Euclio blazes out at Megadorus in verses 551 ff. about those five hundred cooks, each with six hands, so that Argus himself would be no good, does not give the impression either that those 'thieves' are still in his house [3]. Consequently it may be assumed that Congrio's flight in verse 414 was originally his exit.

In Plautus' work, however, matters are different, at the cost of a natural course of events and of a good motivation [4]. His Euclio calls the flying Congrio back in 415, and that with the cry 'stop thief' [5]. He will lodge a complaint against him with the 'tresviri'. Why? Because he has stolen something? No! Because he is carrying a knife. The cook is sorry that he has not immediately struck a blow at Euclio with it, but the latter gives him a set-down:

1) Verses 462–464:
Eucl. Veluti Megadorus me tentat omnibus miserum modis:
Qui simulavit mei se honoris mittere huc causa coquos:
Is ea causa misit hoc qui subruperent misero mihi.
The cook and his helpers, meant as a kind surprise, are considered by Euclio as a scouting-patrol. What Krieger asserts on p. 45, that Megadorus clearly says in verse 263 (*ibo igitur, parabo*) that Euclio need not see to anything, is erroneous.

2) But who was going to see to the wedding-banquet at the end of the play? Megadorus' cook would see to that. His seemingly unnecessary presence already shows that Congrio was predestined to run away. The motif of the fugitive cook is also found in *Epitrep.*, verses 392 ff. J.

3) In my opinion verses 551—557a (compare 551—552 with 394—395) have more conclusive force than 558—559 in particular, which are quoted by Krieger (p. 50). Economy is used as a cloak for fear. Fraenkel (p. 80) ascribes verses 551—559 entirely to Plautus, because such a conglomeration of mythology is unlike Menander's method. That this may be a reason to doubt Menander's authorship of the model apparently does not occur to Fraenkel.

4) Very queer is Krieger's solution of the case (p. 42, p. 47): 'In Plautus' play the cook left contrary to Euclio's command (verses 452 ff.), in the original according to Euclio's command'. If one has Euclio say verse 459b (abi to modo), it is possible to have Congrio go away.

5) Verse 415. Eucl. Redi, quo fugis nunc? tene, tene.

'There is no greater rogue on God's earth than Congrio, not any one whom he would have greater pleasure in injuring in cold blood.' This Congrio is quite ready to believe even without Euclio saying so, 'because he has been beaten to a jelly and no *cinaedus* could possibly be as soft as he is' [1]. In this way things go on, during thirty verses of the same tenor, until Euclio suddenly rushes into the house (verse 444). It appears that he has forgotten his pot, and he returns with it, 5 verses farther. The pot with its precious contents had therefore been clearly visible in the house from verse 415 on! Or can it be supposed that he digs it up during the verses 445—448? Such a supposition is not utterly impossible for Plautus' action, but only in the literal sense of the words Plautus' action, because he never properly discounts the duration of an action behind the scenes. Thus it is proved that, no matter how one considers things, verses 415—448 do not originate from the model. That in the original the miser came out of the house, pot in hand, immediately after verse 414 is evident from the long drawn-out recitation of verses 406—414. This passage was purposely intended to cover the time which Euclio needed for digging. Any one denying this would fall from one absurdity into another. For it would really be absurd for the miser to drive the pack of cooks out of the house (406), then first to stay inside, inactive and without a reason, until Congrio had finished speaking (406—414), and then at last to continue the interrupted chase. It goes without saying that together with the verses 415—448 their immediate sequel, the verses 451—459, are likewise to be ascribed to Plautus. Even if we consider them by themselves they are suspect, for it is far from natural that Euclio should expose his pot of gold to the indiscreet eyes of the pack of cooks.

That Plautus could write scenes like the one of Euclio and

1) Verses 419—422:

Eucl. Homo nullust te scelestior qui vivat hodie
    Neque quoi ego de industria amplius male plus lubens faxim.
Congr. Pol etsi taceas, palam id quidemst: res ipsa testist.
    Ita fustibus sum mollior magis quam ullus cinaedus.

With regard to these verses Krieger says on p. 45: 'Haec quoque scaena Atticum spiritum redolet'! However, he has recognized the Plautine spirit of part of the continuation.

Congrio, and in fact relished it, is generally known. I do not assert that every scene in his work where the actors revel in their own strong terms and feast on jokes about backsides beaten to a jelly and split skulls, is a product of Plautus' invention. But if such a scene disturbs the course of the action, is full of improbabilities and moreover occurs in a comedy which had been greatly attenuated by cuts, then the chance that the adapter has had a hand in it is no longer a chance but a certainty. On that account Euclio's dispute with Congrio, the verses 415—448 and 451—459, is not a part of the original play [1]).

The action in its reconstructed form is most simple. At verse 414 Congrio and his helpers disappeared. At the same moment Euclio cautiously came out of the house with his precious pot and said, as in verses 449—450 in Plautus' work [2]), that the gold was no longer safe in the house. Whither did he wish to go with the pot? In the Latin play he is silent about this and with good reason. For had he immediately (at verse 450) mentioned his object, the Fides-temple on the stage, it would have been most singular and incomprehensible that full 25 verses later, on Megadorus' undesired approach, he had not yet arrived there. As Plautus could not and would not do without the scene of Euclio and Megadorus (verses 475 ff.) he seemingly leaves Euclio's object undecided until he is alone again after Megadorus' exit in 580 [3]); and for that reason it is not too striking that their meeting was by no means unavoidable. It cannot be doubted that in the original the miser knew his object at once and mentioned it. For there the situation did not prevent this, on the contrary, it

1) Therefore the authenticity of verses 309—310, which Jachmann (p. 130) suspects in connection with verse 444 and verse 458, remains intact. This does not mean that with Plautus one is ever sure of 'a true copy'.

2) Verses 449—450:

Hoc quidem hercle quoquo ego ibo mecum erit, mecum feram,
Neque istic in tantis periclis umquam committam ut siet.

That he is going to keep it with him from that time onward is of course only a manner of speaking. If that had been meant literally, he might have remained in the house with the pot.

3) Krieger has felt this hitch (p. 52), but without any ground he has drawn the conclusion from it that in the Greek model of this scene the miser was still without a pot and without any plans of removing it and joined Megadorus at verse 571 in order to have a drink. Vide p. 18.

required this. He had to go to the heroion outside the stage, to the right [1]. Consequently, no matter whether he walked quickly or slowly, it was perfectly unavoidable and natural that he met Megadorus coming back from the town, i.e. from the right. The whole of this action is still recognizable in the Latin text. At verse 460 the miser starting from his house, i.e. from the left-hand side of the stage [2], proceeded on his way, walking cautiously with his heavy pot and busily talking to himself. But at verse 473 he stopped suddenly and stiffened. There he saw Megadorus approaching. He could not pass him; Megadorus would certainly detain him in order to have a chat (474). Therefore he moved backwards a little hoping that Megadorus would enter his house without seeing him. But Megadorus was not in a hurry; he showed off his theories on marriage to the audience—a monologue which Plautus has trebled by adding 40 verses [3]. When he had finished speaking and turned to enter his house he was surprised to see his neighbour Euclio, who wished to slip past him just then [4]. A conversation ensued, which Plautus has kept in verses 537 ff. with a few alterations.

In order to fully understand these alterations we have to start from a question mentioned above [5]. Is it not strange that Euclio should be talking to Megadorus during 40 verses while he as it were displays his secret, his pot of gold, to him? This is certainly strange and a violation of probability—in the work of Plautus, who had replaced the Heros of the original by the Lar worshipped in the house. On this account the wreaths, which the miser had bought as an offering [6], remain on the Lar's altar, in the house. But in the Greek play those wreaths were destined for the Heros, so that Euclio could take the pot of gold to the heroion by way of an sacrificial pot, whose contents were hidden by wreaths [7]. Hence

1) Vide pp. 37 f.
2) Vide pp. 38 f.
3) Vide pp. 85 f., p. 85, note 2.
4) Verse 536. Sed eccum adfinem ante aedis. quid agis, Euclio?
5) Vide p. 88.
6) Verses 385—387.
7) It will now also be possible to examine verses 537—580 analytically. The changes are a result of the difference in situation; for Plautus' Euclio wanders about aimlessly with a queer pot, whereas the Greek Euclio was on his way to the heroion carrying a pot adorned for an offering. Whereas

it follows anew—a fact which we have pointed out before and which we shall presently show to follow from the scenes themselves—that Fides and Silvanus did not belong to the original and are no substitutes for Πίστις and for Πάν or for any god whatsoever. For if the wreaths went to the Heros, the pot of gold, too, was taken to him and concealed with him.

The expedition of Euclio to the heroion occurred in the entr'acte after the conclusion of III. At this point, verse 586, the 3rd act also comes to an end in Plautus' text. Up to that point we counted 135 inserted verses inclusive of substitutions. As the total extent of the excisions in I—IV was estimated at 225 verses, our calculations naturally lead us to expect insertions in the 4th act too. As we have already seen verses 682—700 serve as a substitution for a much more extensive scene in the original [1]. Immediately preceding that scene there is as an extensive and important insertion the dialogue of Euclio and Strobilus, which we have already mentioned repeatedly, scenes 3—6 of act IV according to the usual numbering of our Plautus-texts (verses 624—681). In my opinion this is not the first insertion in IV, but I wish to treat it first.

That these scenes do not originate from the model was proved by five indicia; the division into acts of the Greek play, the place of its action, the situation of Plautus' Fides-temple, the character of Strobilus II, and Euclio's sacrificial wreaths [2]. We are now in a position to corroborate this proof with other arguments and at the same time make it clear for what reasons Plautus has inserted the four scenes.

We know that he has changed the complex of the Greek ana-

the Latin miser reacts to the words '*quid agis?*', by saying '*nimium lubenter edi sermonem tuom*', the Greek miser replied to a similar question: 'I am going to immolate to the Heros'. To this, accordingly, verses 539—540 referred: 'then you ought to have dressed better'. For Euclio looked dirty after his digging. In Plautus' play the verses have no connection with the context. Verses 563—567 are based on a Latin pun. From verse 575 onward Plautus strikes out his own way. He makes Megadorus' breezy joke: 'I will drink you under the table at the wedding', into the cause of Euclio's resolution, which seemingly does not occur to him before this, to conceal his treasure in the Fides-temple (verses 577 ff.). In the original Euclio chuckled over the fact that he had frustrated Megadorus' evil plan in advance.

1) Vide pp. 74 ff.

2) Vide p. 31, pp. 34 ff., p. 50, pp. 90 f.

gnorisis: he substituted the verses 682—700 for the first part of the recognition and left out the rest. In this connection two points are important for the following argument, first that he changed Phaedra's pregnancy into confinement, secondly that he has expunged the conversation between Megadorus and Euclio. The first point, Phaedra's confinement at verse 691, made it essential that Euclio was not to be at home during the scene 682—700, as he was not to know anything about his daughter's condition for the time being [1]. The second change, the expunction of the scene Megadorus-Euclio, did away with the valid motive that made Euclio rush back to his buried treasure. As there was no Megadorus abandoning the marriage, there was no reason for Euclio to imagine that he had been robbed. Consequently Plautus had to provide two things, in the first place a means to get the miser out of the house and away from the stage before verse 682, in the second place a new way to make him discover the theft after verse 700. He has acquitted himself of this double task with great push by means of doubling. He has repeated the motif of the hidden and stolen treasure, not without a certain climax, and this repetition is to be found in the verses 624—681. Although his accuracy here cannot be praised any more than anywhere else, this doubling was really necessary. One god, with whom the treasure was concealed, was really not enough for Plautus' case and need; now that Euclio after his return home in 615 had to leave again immediately, Plautus needed two gods, one on the stage and one outside the stage. It is evident that one god living on the stage was not sufficient [2]. For that one god on the stage would have kept the miser near the house, whereas during the confinement he had to be away. But one god having his sanctuary outside the stage, too, would not have been sufficient. Supposing that Euclio had immediately—at verse 586— gone to bury his treasure with this god and that all the rest had been as described in verses 587—623 (Strobilus' arrival, Euclio's return, Strobilus' exit to the betrayed hiding-place) and that, prompted by an uneasy misgiving, Euclio

1) Although the 'cry' (691—692) was intended for the stage, it was no less distinctly audible inside. Euclio was to remain ignorant until within the scene 727—807.

2) Francken, *Plaut. Aul.* p. IX, is not aware of this.

would next have returned again to the sanctuary at a given moment, —then the given moment would have been either too early or too late. For that moment would have had to fulfil two requirements which could not be combined. It would have to be so early that Euclio would have been out of the house and off the stage before the confinement, and at the same time so late that he would not reach the sanctuary before the thief had taken away the treasure. That this is asking too much is immediately seen if we cut away from Plautus' text the scenes 4—6, which are laid in front of the Fides-temple (verses 628—681), and assume that Euclio immediately takes his treasure to Silvanus at verse 586. In this case—having returned home again and having been warned there by a misgiving—he would either have to go back to the Silvanus-sanctuary before verse 682 (which means at verse 627 [1])), or after verse 700. In the former case the frustration of the theft was unavoidable, because he really followed the thief closely [2]), in the latter case he would be a witness of the birth of the child.

The logical consequence for Plautus is obvious now. The future course of the action made it imperative that Euclio should for the presence not notice anything of Phaedra's confinement. So it was imperative that he should frustrate the theft, and consequently it was necessary that the theft should be doubled. The theft did not succeed before it had first failed. A new piece of action followed from that failure of its own accord, a repetition of the concealment of the gold, which could be arranged in such a way that this time the thief had his hands free while at the same time the miser was far away from home during the confinement. But a complete doubling of all the parts of the old action was no more necessary than it was possible. The Greek play had one 'expedition of concealment' of Euclio and one 'expedition of inspection', the one before, the other after the anagnorisis-complex of circa 100 verses. During the anagnorisis Euclio was at home and was dressing [3]). These two expeditions have been combined by Plautus (with him they are not separated by circa 100 verses, but by 8, viz. 616—623) and

1) Verses 628—681 fall out.
2) Just as he actually frustrates the theft in the Fides-temple.
3) Cf. verse 612, Vide pp. 78 f.

placed before his '*recognitio*' as verses 582—672; but now, as we have seen, the theft was frustrated, so that the treasure had to be hidden anew and elsewhere (vide verse 673). It goes without saying that Euclio was not to return from this second 'expedition of concealment', before the *recognitio,* i.e. the *partus,* had taken place. Therefore Plautus covered that second expedition of concealment by means of his scene of recognition (verses 682—700). Then, however, he had no means of cover at his disposal for a second, separate expedition of inspection, and besides he lacked a motive to have Euclio go out anew for inspection. On that account he now welded the inspection to the concealment and made Euclio bury the treasure and discover the theft of the treasure within one period of absence (verses 676—713) [1]. Plautus owes the means to effect this combination to his Greek source, which he follows again as an example in verses 701 ff. In these verses the thief, Strobilus, gives the audience an account of his experiences. The theft, he tells the audience, had already succeeded, he was already on his way back with the booty, and there he saw Euclio advancing in front of him, but before Euclio got sight of him he quickly went some distance aside, and the miser passed without seeing him (verses 710—711). What is described here is a moment from the 'expedition of inspection' of the Greek play, Strobilus' photograph of the miser as he was on his way from the stage to the heroion after Megadorus' breach of promise. The situation compelled Strobilus to step aside and let the miser pass, because Strobilus himself was at that moment returning from the heroion. Plautus has coolly copied this and utilized it for his own purpose. His Euclio while on his way home suddenly returns to the Silvanus-sanctuary.... to discover that his treasure has been stolen. What induced him to return? It would seem impertinent to ask this of a person who is absent!

On considering, as a conclusion, the Fides-scenes as an independent whole, we state that both their merits and their demerits are characteristic of the Plautine origin. Praise and disapproval have been lavished on those scenes [2]. They deserve both, for the very

1) Cf. p. 25, pp. 99 f.

2) Enk II 1 pp. 178 f. quotes Fénelon, *Lettre à l'Académie* Ch. VII, E. Thirion, *Théatre choisi de Molière* p. 533 and W. W. Blancké, *The dram. values of Plautus* p. 56.

merits and demerits on account of which Plautus is always to be praised and blamed. Detached from the context of the action they are a specimen of dramatic art which grips us at once, just as the poet himself apparently has been gripped by his own theme: an old miser, who is insane with suspicion and fear, catches a thief in the nick of time, drags him on, beats him, shakes him and questions him. But the thief maintains his total innocence with imperturbability, and we understand that in the end he is sure to secure the booty after all, because the miser is bound to betray himself in his exaggerated dread. The language shows that Plautus is an excellent writer, which in fact we all know, and it is full of admirable finds; the dialogue is exciting, so that it seems as if we hear the quick breathing of the speakers, and their words put the action very vividly before us. The poet has visualized the scene as he was writing it.

But the motivations, which create the situation and bring about the progress of the action, are all very weak and clumsy. The reader falls from one astonishment into the other. Euclio has entered his house in order to wash and dress (verse 612); he comes back, because—apparently from his inner room!—he has seen a raven scratch up the ground [1]. Now he rushes into the Fides-temple and drags the thief out of it (verse 628); after 30 verses' investigation it suddenly occurs to him that he had noticed another thief there, a helper—a very poor pretext. If that had been the case he would have interrogated Strobilus either in the temple or at the door, so as to keep an eye on the helper at the same time. The childish simplicity of this invention makes the poet's intention only too transparent. For an intelligent slave like Strobilus it is almost an insult to have to accept such a tip, and to lie in wait again during Euclio's second visit to the temple, so that he can listen to him anew after his return (verses 661 ff.). It is incredibly insipid that Euclio should betray himself a second time (verses 667 ff.); it is no less absurd that, after the theft, as he enters the stage in search of the thief (verse 713), he should not have any suspicion against the unknown slave, whom

1) Verses 624—627. Krieger's criticism of these verses (p. 57) is somewhat exaggerated, but essentially correct.

he had caught in the Fides-temple. But at this point, at verse 713, Plautus follows the Greek text again, and does not bother about the small logical consequences of his own additions. I think I have proved the Plautine origin of the verses 624—681 in every way.

There now remains only one insertion of some extent to be treated, the verses 587—607. In his scene before the Fides-temple (verses 628 ff.) Plautus brought the slave and the miser into actual contact, thus giving the action a turn which was diametrically opposed to the Greek model. For there Euclio did not catch sight of the thief Strobilus for a moment. That change implied one definite logical consequence, which was imperative: the attempt to steal the gold could only be made by a slave who was a perfect stranger to Euclio. For he would immediately have informed against a slave he knew, his neighbour's slave, to the master and, if he had not done this, he would certainly have held him responsible for the later theft. Plautus has thoroughly realized that that lack of acquaintance was an essential requirement in case of actual contact, and the concrete result was that he split up Strobilus into two equal and yet unequal parts, Megadorus' slave and Lyconides' slave. That splitting up would not have been necessary if he had not inserted the scenes in front of the temple; as Megadorus' slave, Strobilus might have taken an interest in his master's nephew. If Plautus thought the splitting up desirable all the same, then he might, without a Fides-episode, have given to his Strobilus II the knowledge of the place and its inhabitants, which, as the slave of Megadorus' nephew, he would naturally have possessed. But he does not possess that knowledge. Lyconides' slave is a stranger in Jerusalem. When he enters the stage for his monologue 587—607, he is already perfectly adapted for the scene in which he will play the opposite number to Euclio. He appears to know the place of action only in so far as it has been pointed out to him by his master; he is able to point out the two houses with the names of the inmates, Megadorus, Euclio (verses 603—604), but it is evident that he has never in his life seen the miser. For when the latter has walked past him, he at first refers to him as '*hunc hominem*', and only after that, because 'that man' has entered Euclio's house, the thought occurs to him

that it may be Euclio [1]. Consequently the Strobilus of the verses 587 ff. has been drafted as he ought to be in the Fides-scenes.

Further it should be considered how his appearance on the stage is motivated. His master, he says, has sent him there in order to spy (verse 605). However, seeing that Lyconides himself is already approaching, that task is a meaningless fiction. The motivation is wrong; it must have been invented by Plautus. One may perhaps ask, how we can know this and whether the Greek Strobilus motivated his entrance better. One reply deals with both questions. The Greek Strobilus did not motivate his entrance at all; coming home from an errand he did not need any such motivation. It follows that the verses and the fiction of the espionage are Plautus'. It is no wonder that he could not invent anything better here, for nothing is so difficult for an adapter as the motivation of an action that was self-evident in his model. But it must be admitted that Plautus has kept up his fiction excellently.... and that better than Strobilus! He returns to it three times; for his Strobilus says in verse 680 that he gives up any further espionage [2], and his Lyconides ponders twice, in verse 696 and in verse 804, on the question of where his slave can be. In these two places the meaninglessness of Strobilus' task probably appears most clearly, not only because Lyconides certainly does not need a spy any longer now that he is present himself, but also because at verse 696 the matter of the marriage has already come to a point where any espionage is folly. The lover has already confessed his guilt and Megadorus is really no longer a bridegroom now; consequently Strobilus' task has become entirely superfluous. But why does Plautus' Lyconides ask for that superfluous slave twice, and at moments when his mind ought to be full of quite different things? In 804 he asks for him because Plautus wishes to bridge over the entr'acte between IV and V [3], and in 696 because the audience need some support. Lyconides' words run: 'Sed servom meum Strobilum miror ubi sit, quem ego me iusseram

1) Verse 619:
Atque hic pater est *ut ego opinor* huius erus quam amat, Euclio.
Vide p. 42, note 4, p. 82, note 4.

2) Verse 680. Quamquam hic manere me erus sese iusserat:
Certumst malam rem potius quaeram cum lucro.

3) Vide p. 29, p. 33, pp. 84 f.

hic opperiri'. After these words both the most stupid and the most sagacious people know what had not been said so explicitly anywhere: this is the master of the slave, who went away contrary to his orders (verse 680) and that slave is called Strobilus.

As I have proved, the verses where Strobilus acts as a spy, 605—607, are decidedly by Plautus [1]. Consequently the same judgment applies to 603—604, because they mention the reason of the espionage. Besides these verses bear in themselves a characteristic feature of spuriousness, because obviously they are meant for the Roman audience, who are reminded by the anonymous slave of the half-forgotten anonymous young man from the Lar's prologue, that nephew of Megadorus and Phaedra's future husband [2]. As Plautus had expunged all the scenes in which the prototype of that young man figured, he had to make up for the resulting defect by means of a new exposition. The two verses mentioned are the sum and substance of this exposition, to which the long introduction of 16 verses leads us up in a would-be casual way. This introduction is a clever feat in its way, because by some considerations of a general nature the speaker succeeds in gradually making the audience guess whose slave he is and whose interests he has come to look after. In this way he gives a seeming artlessness to his entrance, to his person and to his communication of new facts. The result is that one nearly forgets how singular it is that the stage-lover of the drama is announced 600 verses after the beginning, by a faithful servant, about whom one could swear that one had seen him before, as Megadorus' servant, if his bearing were not a proof to the contrary. Therefore it must be admitted that Plautus has helped himself out of a scrape not without tact. But the Plautine spirit is not on that account less tangible in this piece. The slave commences with one of Plautus' favourite themes: the duties of the good slave [3]. This leads him up to the special question

1) On p. 19 (note 1) I have pointed out the fantastic character of Krieger's interpretation. Cf. p. 99, note 2.

2) Verses 28—29, 34—36. — On Lyconides' and Eunomia's entry in verse 682 Plautus audience must have understood that she had informed her son of Megadorus' marriage-plan; in my opinion this was Plautus' conception of the matter, not that Strobilus had brought the news. Vide p. 19, note 1.

3) See e.g. *Rudens* verses 914—924, *Mostell.* verses 859 ff., both of which are passages inserted by Plautus.

of what may be the task of a slave whose master has got entangled in Amor's nets [1]. That question leads Plautus to the point. The slave says that his master is in love with the daughter of Euclio-here, and has learned just now that she has been married off to Megadorus-here; he mentions his task of spying and sits down on the altar, 'where his presence cannot raise any suspicion' [2]. Of course it cannot! On every stage-altar there should be a run-away slave, or one who seems to have run away! While he is sitting there (the Greek Strobilus had entered the house, i.e. Megadorus' house, when he saw Euclio approaching from the right) the miser comes out of the Fides-temple. Consequently the verses 587—607 do not contain a word originating from the model. They serve as a substitution for a brief monologue in which Strobilus said that he had delivered his message.

Verses 608—623, on the contrary, are based on the Greek. Whereas they are authentic as to their tendency they are different in details. This appears from the frequently repeated '*Fides*', which moreover is splendidly suited to Plautus' favourite play with words and sounds [3]. It stands to reason that the greatest changes have been brought about in the latter half of this little scene, in verses 616—623 [4]. For here Strobilus is speaking, who has been metamorphosed himself.

We have now finished the discussion of Plautus' cuts, substitutions and insertions of the first four acts of the original, represented by the verses 40—807. It has appeared that the Greek plot differed considerably and in many respects from the Latin adaptation. Although this applies to act IV in the highest degree, it also refers to the preceding acts. The original gave Euclio the time to bury his treasure by means of an entr'acte between III and IV, while the time which Strobilus needed to go and dig it up was

1) Verses 592—598. It will be noticed that I do not hold that these verses are interpolated (vide Goetz ad loc., Legrand p. 115). They are indispensable as a generalizing introduction to verse 603 and the whole passage betrays considerable embarrassment on Plautus' part.

2) Vide p. 98, note 1.

3) E.g. in verses 614—615, 618, 621—623. Vide p. 35, note 6.

4) Verses 616 (*hunc hominem*), 619.

sufficiently covered by 4 scenes of 100 verses in all [1]. This reasonable relation of time of the action on and behind the stage was observed everywhere. Strobilus' entry at the beginning of the 4th act—the first approach to the theft—was justified there as the return from an errand. We may safely say, I think, that the motivation of the action was everywhere natural and plausible. The errand was connected with the secret of Lyconides, the stage-lover, who from the first act took an active part in the plot. The two component parts of the theme therefore ran parallel and supported each other mutually in a causal connection, an interaction which was also continued at the climax of the plot; for Euclio's discovery of the theft was really the result of the anagnorisis [2]. There was as little a break or discrepancy in the *dramatis personae* as there was in the dramatic construction. The scene of the action was the country, which in fact the character of Euclio, a poor countryman, made us expect. There were only two houses on the stage, which was the usual thing [3]; and the location of Eunomia's dwelling-place and of the heroion took into consideration the requirements of the balance and the situation [4]. Plautus has not retained any of these features. It is no use extending the list or considering it in detail. But before I attempt to derive the contents of the Greek 5th act from the data available now, I first have to say a few words regarding the prologue of the play, which Plautus has preserved in the address of his Lar (verses 1—39).

On reading that address while bearing in mind the original previous history we shall soon see that much more has been changed therein than just a few details of name and place [5]. The verses 1—5 have been changed, where the situation is sketched by the Lar coming out of the house, and not by a Heros coming from the right. A change, too, has been made in verse 7, where it says that the treasure had been buried '*in medio foco*', and another in verses

1) Vide p. 25, pp. 31ff., p. 85.
2) Cf. p. 21, vide pp. 78 ff.
3) Vide pp. 34 ff.
4) Vide p. 37, p. 51, note 1.
5) Bierma (p. 51) says that many changes have been made, but he does not say what changes. Krieger (p. 12) considers the whole prologue to be 'Attic', with the exception of some verses.

28—29 where it says that 'a distinguished young man k n o w s' who the girl is whom he has violated. Not less remarkable, however, than those changes are the hiatuses and lacunae, which can be observed here and there even without a knowledge of the original previous history. For example, a certain abruptness is felt on reading the transition from the '*thensaurus*' in verse 12 to the '*agri non magnus modus*' in verse 13, of which the cause becomes clear if we consider that in verse 13 Plautus mentions an *ager* which in the Greek play had already been mentioned in the first few verses of the prologue. For in the Greek play the treasure was connected with the field. Euclio's grandfather had buried the gold near the chapel of the Heros, where his field, too, was situated. A little farther on, after verse 20, one wonders why no mention is made of the fact that Euclio inherits that field, just as his father did before him [1]). It is not improbable that, as Plautus chose the town as the scene of action, he does not mention the field anew on purpose. However that may be, there is an obvious gap between verse 22 and verse 23. The Lar mentions Euclio's daughter immediately after the miser himself, but is silent about his wife. Yet it would seem necessary, in order to understand the comedy properly, to learn here at once that the girl's mother is dead. But we do not learn anything about Euclio's deceased wife farther on any more than in the exposition of the Lar, where i.a. on account of that gap the contrast in character between Euclio and his daughter remains unexplained [2]). We know now that in the original the god disclosed a mysterious fact regarding Phaedra's mother, which was unacceptable to Plautus as an element of the dramatic history. This is the reason why the Lar does not speak about her, and as it were creates the daughter out of Euclio's head. It follows that a cut has been made after verse 22.

Plautus has made further cuts after the verses 28—30, which were written as a result of his changes. This comes to light, because at the end he has been obliged to give a supplement to his com-

1) Verses 13—14, vide p. 35, note 1, p. 41, note 1.

2) Verses 23 ff. Huic filia unast: ea mihi cotidie
Aut ture aut vino aut aliqui semper supplicat:
Dat mihi coronas.

munication regarding Lyconides. In 28 he says that 'a young man' has violated the miser's daughter, and as a kind of note he adds 7 verses later that this 'young man' is Megadorus' nephew. It seems to me to be beyond doubt that that communication is really a postscript, added because by his change in the story after verse 27 Plautus was compelled to give some further explanations at verse 34. In his source Lyconides could be mentioned immediately after Euclio and Phaedra as their neighbour's son, the young man from the other house. In the story of their unknown relation the pledge, Phaedra's ring, and the origin of that ring of course came in for discussion, so that the double discovery of the anagnorisis would be understandable to the audience. Plautus replaced all this by the brief text of verses 28—30. The young man from the neighbouring house becomes a certain 'young man of good family', whose dwelling-place remains unmentioned because it is off the stage. Only after that is the second stage-house mentioned, as the dwelling-place of the old neighbour Megadorus, the '*senex de proxumo*', who is going to ask Euclio for his daughter's hand (verses 31 ff.). From this *senex* Plautus' Lar returns to the *adulescens* mentioned above: the old man (the audience is to know) is the uncle of the young man who has violated the girl; this happened (the audience is to know further) at night at the Ceres-festival [1]).

The verses 34—36 are no doubt a postscript by Plautus by way of compensation for expunctions; the verses 31—33 on the contrary are in conformity with the original as far as their tendency goes, but that tendency can only be understood on the ground of the old *donnée* [2]). The Lar uses the old Megadorus and his proposal, he says, in order to pave the way for Lyconides. But for the time being it is incomprehensible in what way that means can be of

1) Verses 34 ff. Et hic qui poscet eam sibi uxorem senex,
Is adulescentis illius est avonculus,
Qui illam stupravit noctu, Cereris vigiliis.

From this order of Plautus' communications critics might have deduced that in Plautus' play Lyconides is not a housemate of Megadorus'. Vide pp. 47 ff.

2) Verses 31 ff. Eam ego hodie faciam ut hic senex de proxumo
Sibi uxorem poscat. id ea faciam gratia,
Quo ille eam facilius ducat qui conpresserat.

service, and it remains incomprehensible to the end that it is really necessary. This means is only good and only has sense in the original composition of the facts, where it is logical and effective and necessary. For the proposal will cause Lyconides, whose hesitation one fully realizes and sympathizes with, to act, and thus it will bring to light the two secrets, Lyconides' and Megadorus'. But Plautus' lover does not have an actual reason for hesitation and uncertainty and delay. Consequently the Lar dupes the old man without any inner necessity, and this proves that he repeats the words of the Heros, who brought about the good of all with harsh but necessary means [1]).

Now that we have fixed the essential contents of the address by the Heros, a question arises by virtue of those contents: where did this address occur in the Greek play; has Plautus transposed it as he has done in the *Rudens* and consequently changed it from a continuation of the exposition into a prologue? It will not be possible to give proof positive of this, as could be done with the *Rudens* [2]), because the text of the *Aulularia* does not show a clear break in the scenes of the exposition any more than after them, but nevertheless the fact seems to be plausible in view of the condition itself of the prologue.

It is characteristic of the Lar's prologue that it is incomplete and at the same time, as Legrand and others have observed, superfluous [3]). It is to be called incomplete, because it does not mention that Euclio has hidden his treasure again, that Lyconides loves Phaedra, and that Phaedra is pregnant and has entrusted her secret to Staphyla. Nor shall we find the name of Eunomia, who, as Megadorus' own sister, should have been mentioned together with and for the sake of Lyconides, the son of that sister [4]). On account of this incompleteness the address is not a real prologue. However,

1) This reminds us of the 'quarrel for the good' fomented by Agnoia in Menander's *Perikeiromene* (cf. verses 42—50). Perhaps the figure in the prologue of the original of the *Rudens* has justified his boisterous behaviour in a similar way.

2) Vide Kuiper *Diph. i. d. Rud.* p. 17. 3) Legrand p. 397.

4) This is Plautus' omission and independent of the original; for there the relation between Megadorus and Lyconides had nothing to do with Eunomia. Plautus' omission is therefore a proof that he has changed the relationship.

as a part of Plautus' play it is also superfluous, because the Lar does not mention any fact that is unknown to one or other of the human characters or that is not made known by them, except this one thing that Euclio's grandfather buried the treasure in former times. But this does not concern the plot, which is not based on the fact that the grandfather buried the gold, but on the fact that Euclio possesses an unknown treasure. The question where he has found it is not a special secret of the god's, but a detail of Euclio's secret, which he might divulge to the audience if necessary, just as he tells the audience that he possesses gold and has hidden it (verses 63, 65, 107—109). Consequently the one part of the double theme in the *Aulularia,* that of the treasure, is not built on an absolute secret, on an utter mystery, which a god has to expose to the audience. The same thing applies to the other part, Lyconides' paternity. The person who learns from Staphyla that Euclio is bound to ultimately discover his daughter's pregnancy and disgrace [1]), will understand of his own accord what Staphyla does not say, but could say if required, that Phaedra expects a child procreated by an unknown man. Consequently when Lyconides appears afterwards (verse 682) and says that he is the father, all the difficulties are solved. The Lar's previous disclosure (verses 28—29) is not indispensable for a good understanding of Plautus' so-called recognition.

In the original, however, the god's monologue was indispensable, both for its own sake and for the sake of the god. The Heros had to introduce himself, because in the course of the play he got the treasure at his disposal again, and consequently had an active part in the action. The address was indispensable because there were two real secrets in the play. For first it was only known to the gods who had brought this misfortune on Phaedra, and secondly no human being realized the possibility that Phaedra might be Megadorus' daughter. To the characters that fact and that possibility could only appear through a means of recognition, in a formal anagnorisis. It is self-evident that, in order to be able to follow the anagnorisis, the audience needed a previous disclosure of these mysteries and that only as a result of this disclosure did they understand that Mega-

1) Verses 74 f.

dorus was threatened by a peril of which he was unconscious—the most important fact of the plot.

Whereas the Lar's address is consequently to be called 'incomplete and superfluous', the latter designation does not apply to the Heros' address. But it was incomplete, as appears from its copy. And therefore it was not, in all probability, a prologue, but occurred —indispensable as it was for the disclosure of the most secret facts— at the end of the exposition, i.e. after the scene of Megadorus and Lyconides, which Plautus has replaced by verses 120—175. As I have said, I cannot give positive proof of this, but it seems to me to be plausible on three grounds, two of which refer to the contents while one refers to the form of the address. In the first place it is plausible that the absolute disclosure of the god followed the partial disclosures of the human characters. They know only part of the truth and expose this to the audience. The god supplements and corrects. Supplements and corrections naturally come in the second place. Viewed from this aspect matters are topsy-turvy in the *Aulularia*. What Euclio and Staphyla tell the audience there (verses 63, 65, 105, 110—117, 74 ff.) does not possess the character of a disclosure, after the Lar's address. Their communications have the nature of an illustration, or perhaps, if one prefers, an elaboration, but not of an exposition given in the form of thinking aloud, for which they are apparently meant. The second reason is that, as I have said, four facts are lacking in the account of the god, which one would expect to hear in a real prologue, first that Euclio has concealed the treasure as soon as he has found it, secondly that Phaedra is pregnant, thirdly that Staphyla knows this, and fourthly that Lyconides loves Phaedra. We may be sure that the Heros has not disclosed these facts, the special secrets of Euclio, Staphyla and Lyconides, any more than Plautus' Lar. For if Plautus had found them in his model he would certainly have copied them, since he has kept all these four facts as data for his play. There was no reason for him to delete anything in his prologue that served as a substruction of his plot [1]). Why then did the Heros not mention

1) The absence of what has been mentioned in the fourth place in particular is most characteristic. In the Greek play Lyconides himself had

these facts? In order not to anticipate or not to repeat? The latter is most probable, I think. Considered in the large whole of the exposition the Heros' address did not have the character of a real prologue, but of a conclusion and a completion.

If the choice and the arrangement of the facts communicated by the god are considered, our thesis will be found correct. The god gives the previous history, but he does not give the actual state of affairs. The first fact of the history of the treasure which he relates is many years old (verse 6), the last is many months old (verse 26). Phaedra's history presents a similar picture: 'a young man whose identity has not been revealed has violated her' (verses 28, 30). The god does not say what her present condition is, nor how Euclio has treated his treasure-trove. At the end of the previous history he skips on to the future (verses 31 ff.). Consequently we read a piece of history which is intended to explain some unmentioned actual facts, the fact that Euclio is extremely rich and is considered to be poor and the fact of his daughter's disgrace. Here, too, we may be sure that Plautus has preserved the structural form of the original account, and this form is clearly that of explaining the familiar present from the unknown past, a current procedure utilized by Menander, as we all know, in his *Perikeiromene.* There the all-knowing Agnoia explains how many vicissitudes caused Glykera to move into the house where she has been seen to live in a scene played previously and how she has got into that difficulty in which she appeared to be in that scene. Similarly it is Tyche's task in the *Fragmenta Florentina* to elucidate the facts of the preceding scenes by relating the earlier history. The same thing is done by Auxilium in the *Cistellaria,* where Plautus has preserved the address of the god in the old place, i.e. after the exposition by the actors [1]. It cannot be doubted but that the monologue of Auxilium's prototype had an

informed the audience of this fact, at the end of the scene I 3, which Plautus has deleted. Plautus does not make up for this before verse 603, which is far too late from a dramatic point of view.

1) Similarly the Heros, too, who appeared in Menander's play of the same name after the introductory scene of the two slaves, must first of all have communicated how Plangon and Gorgias, who had been mentioned previously, had come into the house of their supposed father Tibeios.

identical tendency [1]. The comparison with Menander does not have its full force because it is not certain that the model of the *Aulularia* was his work. But that model was certainly so much related to Menander's art, both in its structure and its contents, that those parallels cannot be put on one side. And although the arguments adduced are not quite conclusive, yet I think that they show that the Heros' address was of a type which cannot be imagined better placed anywhere else but after the exposition of the human characters.

Finally we have now come to the 5th act and have to attempt to gather from the data available how the Attic poet has ultimately developed the matters of theft, marriage and dowry. The data are: first the logic of the facts, secondly the state of affairs at the end of IV in the original play. The logic of the facts is corroborated by the fragments of the conclusion of the *Aulularia* and by the two *Argumenta*. Therefore we know that Lyconides met Strobilus, that Euclio recovered possession of his treasure after Lyconides' interference, that Lyconides got Phaedra to wife with a dowry, probably even with the whole of the treasure, and that in all probability Strobilus became a free man and obtained a sum of money into the bargain by way of outfit [2]. But we have to guess how all this was brought about, which actors contributed to the results and how many scenes the last act had. The elaborated reconstructions of the conclusion of the *Aulularia* are null and void in this respect [3]. For in view of the fact that at the end of IV the situation of the *Aularia* and that of its model were entirely different it is impossible that the 5th act should have developed on exactly the same lines in the two comedies.

The first question is where the Greek Strobilus had concealed

1) Vide Kuiper *Gr. Orig.* pp. 189 ff.

2) Vide fragment 5, together with Goetz' interpretation.

3) A detailed sketch of the lost conclusion is given, e.g. by Legrand (p. 376). His opinion that it may also be applicable to the last act of the original is certainly incorrect. Krieger (p. 85) thinks that Strobilus, the thief, has figured as a philosophical slave, like Onesimos in V of the *Epitrepontes*. This is not less improbable than Jachmann's ethical dénouement (Vide p. 14). The *supplementa* from the editions of Pius and of Beroaldus, inserted in Thomas' edition, are only of (a limited) importance for the Latin play.

the treasure. I will here repeat the reply given to this question before [1]. He had hidden it on private ground, which appears from Plautus [2], and that ground was not his master's house, for in that case Euclio's suspicion against Megadorus would have been justified by the discovery of the treasure. Consequently the treasure lay hidden where Strobilus had taken it willy-nilly, viz. on Euclio's ground, which of course means in his garden. This tallies perfectly with the action [3]. For in V 1 Strobilus returned from Staphyla, to whom he had been sent in IV 8 before he had been able to put his booty in safety. Consequently the gold lay buried in a place where Euclio would look for it last of all, and whence Strobilus might easily fetch it away when everybody was sleeping. For a country garden is not hermetically sealed. Of course things did not come to that. The spot in question exclusively had this unique advantage for the continuation and the conclusion of the history that it seemingly gave the lie to the idea and the suspicion of a theft. If therefore any suspicion should arise against Strobilus, then the treasure lay in that spot as the tangible proof of his innocence. But that proof of his innocence became a proof of his guilt if he pointed out the spot himself. Therefore he had to intimate where the gold lay without saying so himself. If Euclio learned that it had returned to his own garden this would seem to him to be a miracle, but if he were to believe in the miracle for ever he would have to remain ignorant of the very natural course of events and to become firmly convinced that a higher power had effected this. It was Strobilus' business to make him believe this for ever. And no doubt this belief has forced the miser in the end to yield the gold to his daughter as a dowry. How all this may have been brought about will be discussed later. We have to begin at V 1.

In the scene of the *Aulularia* which corresponds to V 1 Lyconides meets his slave on the stage (808 ff.). The slave frankly tells him that he has stolen a pot full of gold from Euclio and concealed it at

1) Vide pp. 81f.

2) Verse 712 '*condam domum*', verse 823 '*in arca apud me*'; consequently not in the open field. And from this it follows that the Greek slave did not hide it in the field either; for in that case Plautus should have copied it.

3) Vide pp. 81.

home in his chest (verses 816—817, 820—823); next he asks whether he may redeem himself (verse 823). When Lyconides refuses indignantly Strobilus bites his tongue and says that the whole story of the theft was a silly joke (824 ff.), but when his master, who does not believe this, addresses him threateningly he swears that no one shall pocket a farthing from him even if they should beat him to death (verses 829—833). The text ends abruptly here, but I think it is clear that Strobilus' last words are mere bragging. He had confessed the theft and betrayed the place where the money lay. His master might have bound him and then gone to fetch the money himself. Probably, however, Plautus thought an agreement as a conclusion of the dispute preferable, so that Strobilus himself went to fetch the money voluntarily after having been promised his liberation.

However this may be, it is more than probable that the Greek scene has not led to such an immediate and complete result, and it is certain that the Greek slave did not commit the series of stupidities of his Latin copy. The action required that he should rouse his master's suspicion, but this result might very well be obtained without that abundance of naïve frankness which Plautus bestows on Strobilus. For there was one thing that Lyconides knew at the commencement of the scene which his Latin namesake did not know. Before hearing about the theft the Greek Lyconides had met the slave when the latter wished to steal into Megadorus' house immediately after the theft [1]), and no doubt he had also seen that he carried something. Therefore, once he had heard about the theft, he might easily conceive a suspicion if the slave only said one word too much.

In what way must Strobilus have gone to work in his attempt to secure the freedom he so impatiently longed for, by means of Euclio's gold, and how did he incur suspicion? In order to make a guess at this we should visualize the situation of the original and then read the dialogue in Plautus. If we do that, Strobilus' plan will appear from verses 820—822 and 830. He intended to tell Lyconides

1) Vide p. 82.

as if it were a joke that he had stolen a pot of gold from Euclio [1]. Strobilus supposed that Lyconides was sure not to believe a word of it, because it was certainly incredible that the poor Euclio should possess a treasure of many pounds of gold. Next he intended, again as a joke, to ask Lyconides whether he might obtain his redemption with the money stolen from Euclio [2]. Had his young master jocularly consented so as to answer a joke with a joke, then he would keep him to his word in sober earnest and go and fetch the money in the night. For once the master, in his guilelessness, had struck the bargain, he could no longer demand an account of the origin of the money to be paid [3]. If Strobilus said that he had found it honestly, no one could compel him as a free man to give chapter and verse. For he was convinced that Euclio would not say that he had been robbed, just as he had always been silent about his riches while he possessed them. And in case he should ultimately assert that a treasure had been stolen from him no one would believe him.

So we see that Strobilus' plan was based on his firm conviction that Lyconides did not know anything of the stolen treasure. But the invented play could not be played without playthings. What he needed in the first place was a pot. The Greek Strobilus came out of Euclio's house and said to Lyconides as though it were a joke: 'I have stolen a pot of gold from Euclio'. There would have been no sense in the joke if he did not carry a pot on coming out of the house and showed it. But if the pot he showed had really been stolen and was full of gold, the joke would not have been a joke. Consequently he came out of Euclio's house carrying a pot which did not belong to Euclio, i.e. which had not been stolen and which did not contain any gold. This means that he was carrying a pot belonging to his master, Megadorus. It may now be asked how this pot got into Euclio's house. To this question Plautus' text gives the reply. In verse 390 it says that Congrio sends away a boy in order to go

1) In Plautus' play, too, he pretends afterwards, in verse 830, that his confession of 820—823 has only been a joke; but he has already cast himself on the mercy of his master, since he has mentioned the hiding-place.

2) Cf. verse 823.

3) A similar plan is made by Gripus in the *Rudens* (verses 928 ff.), in order to redeem himself with money, about the origin of which he is silent.

quickly and borrow a big pot from Megadorus [1]. This shows that the Greek poet had already seen to it in the 3rd act that his stage-property arrived where it ought to be; and it was this pot which Strobilus took home again [2], after having buried Euclio's—full of gold—in Euclio's garden. But notwithstanding the beauty of Strobilus' plan and playthings [3] his play miscarried, because Lyconides knew enough to suspect the truth which was hidden behind the joke. On that account it was useless for Strobilus to attempt to prove to his master, with the pot as evidence, that everything had only been a silly joke [4]. He had roused his master's suspicion and remained suspect.

However, I think it is out of the question that he should have confessed his guilt under duress of Lyconides' accusation, and that for the following reason. Lyconides had promised Euclio and sworn a solemn oath that he would mention the thief if he discovered him and would not save him from his punishment [5]. If therefore Lyconides had had absolute certainty at the end of the scene, it would have been his bounden duty to hand over the culprit to the vindictive Euclio. But such a development of the history, the surrender and the execution of Strobilus, is unimaginable as the conclusion of a comedy. It follows that at the end of V 1 Lyconides did entertain a strong suspicion of Strobilus, but that he did not have the objective certainty which could compel him to mention the thief and the

1) Verse 390. Aulam maiorem si pote ex vicinia
Pete.

2) May be verse 819 contains an allusion to the contents of this pot.

3) It may be assumed that in the original of V 1 Lyconides entered the stage somewhat later than Strobilus. For in Plautus Strobilus begins with three lines of monologue (808—810), which are not intended for Lyconides' ears. It is therefore probable that in the original he has given a brief explanation of his plan.

4) Cf. verse 830.

5) Verses 773--776:

Eucl. Atque id si scies
Qui abstulerit mihi indicabis?
Lycon. Faciam.
Eucl. Neque partem tibi
Ab eo quoiumst inde posces neque furem excipies?
Lycon. Ita.
Eucl. Quid si fallis?
Lycon. Tum me faciat quod volt magnus Iuppiter.

hiding-place. This is corroborated by another clause of the oath mentioned. Lyconides had sworn to Euclio that he would not demand a part of the gold as a reward [1]). Consequently it was a foregone conclusion with the poet that he would not bring Lyconides in a position that would compel him to point out the thief and the hiding-place. For this would be a profit for Euclio and a loss for Lyconides. And yet the treasure came into Lyconides' possession at last, as Phaedra's dowry. By what means the poet has brought about that dénouement eludes us as yet. But in my opinion we can find the reply to the question because we know what means he has not used. The result was brought about without Strobilus being exposed as a thief and without Lyconides discovering the stolen gold. Therefore a reward for services rendered is out of the question. No more was the aim attained because Lyconides claimed his financial demands at the marriage-transaction. For with regard to this transaction Euclio had the law on his side. The law obliged Lyconides to marry the violated girl without a dowry if the father allowed it. It was a favour if he permitted it. He was entitled to refuse and to demand the proper punishment for the crime of the violation. Lyconides might call himself happy if Euclio waived that right [2]). Hence, generally speaking, every reconstruction assuming that Lyconides became the owner of the treasure as a result of his help, of his dexterity, of his persuasion or of Megadorus' support, is to be rejected for the Greek play, even if it does not seem unacceptable for the *Aulularia* [3]).

It is therefore clear that there were two difficulties in the situation, which the poet wished to be there, and which could only be solved by means of an ingenious turn. The thief was not to be unmasked and yet the money had to be found again. The hiding-place was discovered but not pointed out by Lyconides and none the less he got the treasure into his possession as Phaedra's husband. Only Strobilus can have given that turn to the play, as I have pointed

1) Verses 774—775.

2) Vide Beauchet I p. 138 and the present writer's note on this question on p. 86 (note 4).

3) See e.g. Legrand p. 311, p. 376. Jachmann's sketch of a dénouement has been treated on p. 14, note 4. Both of them hold that Plautus' conclusion is in agreement with that of the original. Cf. p. 107, note 3, p. 125.

out above[1]. Strobilus intimated where the gold lay— he was the only human being who knew this—but in such a way that at the same time suspicion left him. This was only possible if that intimation was given as a 'prophecy', as a revelation of a higher knowledge, as a voice from Heaven. If Strobilus staged this miracle, he at once saved himself and created the atmosphere in which another, greater miracle could be imagined: that Euclio would give the lie to his character and renounce his gold.

However, reliable miracles cannot be performed without the undoubted aid of a god. It seems to me that there are few pieces in the Νέα where divine assistance was so ready and near at hand as in the model of the *Aulularia*. For the Heros was more than a '*Prologus*'; he led and propelled the action[2]. Therefore I assume that Strobilus relied on the Heros when he removed the burden of suspicion from himself. It appeared that no one else but the Heros had removed the treasure from the heroion and taken it to Euclio's garden. This was revealed by the god to Strobilus and in this way it reached Euclio's ears.

Where Euclio heard this is hardly to be called a question; this must have taken place on the stage. It can easily be calculated when it took place. After the names of Strobilus and Lyconides, scene V 1 of the *Aulularia* also bears the name of Euclio as a superscription. Consequently Euclio entered the stage at the end of this scene in Plautus' play. And in the original this cannot have been otherwise, because the state of affairs at the end of IV already implied that he would enter again soon after the beginning of V[3]. He had rushed home when he had learned Lyconides' confession and had not replied to his entreaty for forgiveness and to his proposal. Therefore he must have returned not long after the entr'acte when he had drawn out Staphyla, had accused her and cursed her for her gross lack of care, and had finally become reconciled to the idea that he would give his daughter to Lyconides and abstain from vengeance. It is therefore in every way plausible that he should return to the stage at the end

1) Vide pp. 107 f.
2) Vide verses 25—33 and p. 41.
3) See on the entr'acte after verse 807: p. 33, p. 85.

of V 1; and in my opinion he arrived there having been urged by Staphyla [1]. But however that may be, there can be no doubt I think but that Strobilus, the suspected slave, on seeing Euclio fled away from the stage—to the right, of course, since the miser came out of the house on the left—whereupon in V 2 Lyconides' proposal was accepted, but no word was spoken about a dowry of course. Next Strobilus must have entered the stage hurriedly again from the right as a central figure in the next scene, i.e. in V 3, greatly alarmed as he had seen an apparition. For nobody could save the guilty slave and undo the last knot of the action but the god, who had his dwelling-place to the right of the stage, the Heros. Now did Strobilus give an account of what had befallen him on the way and of what had been revealed to him, in the presence of Euclio and Lyconides, or did the ghost follow him on the stage, οἴῳ φαινόμενος, but invisible to the others? [2] To this question the reply may be given that visions which are merely repeated by word of mouth are not half so credible as visions which are acted [3], and therefore not half so useful for the purpose of freeing a suspect from suspicion. Does this mean that the audience saw the Heros appear in the flesh as they had seen him in his prologue? Was this a play with a *deus ex machina* in the last act? I should not be prepared to draw that conclusion. A real theophany may belong to a tragedy of the 5th century, but not to a comedy of the end of the 4th century. And besides, if the Heros had appeared as a complete actor, he might have made his revelation to the miser without Strobilus' mediation. The apparition must have been Strobilus' vision, which seemed to be true on account of the ring of truthfulness in his action. Maybe that the audience and Lyconides—and eventually Strobilus himself—did not even fully realize whether the vision was a lie or not. It did not matter so much after all, as long as Euclio believed it to be true.

1) Verses 806—807 suggest a conversation to be carried on in the house between Euclio and Staphyla. The duration of Euclio's absence, an entr'acte and 1 scene, argues that it was a long and consequently a difficult conversation. See further p. 122, note 3.

2) Cf. R. M. Hickman, *Ghostly Etiquette on the Classical Stage.* (Iowa Stud. in Class. Phil. VII, 1938).

3) Cf. Hor. *Ars Poet.* verses 180 f.:

Segnius inritant animos demissa per aurem
Quam quae sunt oculis subiecta fidelibus.

The reader may in all probability wonder whether this surmise of a vision on the stage is anything more than the present writer's fancy. It may be called a fancy, but examples of a vision on the stage are not lacking in New Comedy [1]. But apart from this it had been the poet's well-considered plan to create a situation here, in which the Heros' assistance was indispensable. Of course he might have rendered that assistence from afar by giving his announcement to Strobilus, yet I insist that a dramatic staging of the case was both preferable and practicable. If we attempt to imagine how this could be realized, we shall have to consider whether a well-known papyrus published more than 30 years ago has not preserved a fragment of this scene V 3. I mean the fragments arranged under a-f in the *Hibeh Papyri* I 5, which Grenfell-Hunt, in agreement with Blass and contrary to Leo, have ascribed to the original of the *Aularia* and to the Comic poet Philemon [2]. The grounds adduced at the time by the editors for this attribution are far from convincing. Their surmise accordingly met with a general disbelief [3]. In my opinion this is not due to the incorrectness of the surmise, but to the wrong argument, for that is based on an erroneous supposition. They have besides weakened their thesis because they coupled the fragments with *Grenfell* II 8b. Though it may be probable that this papyrus originates from the same roll as Hibeh 5, this does not prove that is has belonged to the same comedy [4]. Further the name

1) I remind the reader of *Cistellaria* verses 284 ff., and *Mercator* verses 930 ff. Cf. also Menander's *Theophoroumene,* Koerte ed. 3, p. 101.

2) *The Hibeh Papyri* I (1906) p. 24. The attribution to Philemon is based on the letters κροισ, the preserved beginning of verse 28 (col. III, verse 1), which was identified by Blass with fragment 189 K: **Κροίσῳ λαλῶ σοι καὶ Μίδᾳ καὶ Ταντάλῳ.**

3) Besides Leo I mention Weil, Wilamowitz and Koerte. Vide Schroeder *Nov. Com. Fragm. in pap. reperta exc. Menandreis* (1915), p. 11.

4) Schroeder *l.c.* connects pap. Hibeh 5 with Flind. Petr. 4, Grenfell II 8 (b) and Ryland 16 (a), and attempts to interpret the series of fragments that thus arises as parts of an unknown comedy, which bears little resemblance to the *Aulularia.* One thing, however, has been proved irrefutably by Schroeder: that Flind. Petr. 4 and Hib. 5 are two copies of the same stage-play. For Hibeh 5 col. 2 (verses 6 ff.) appears to be identical with the very mutilated last verses of Fl. P. 4, col. 2. It follows that the fragment Fl. P. 4, col. 1, which is also mutilated, contains a passage that immediately preceded Hib. 5, col. 1. For a possible identification of that fragment with the opening of scene V 2 of the *Greek Aulularia* see p. 122, note 3.

of Philemon furnished the critics with a weapon. It was thought impossible that Philemon should be the poet of the model of the *Aulularia*. But it was forgotten that the question of who was the author of the model can be put on one side if one has to find out whether papyrus Hibeh 5 has belonged to it or not. I think that the former question cannot be settled and am of opinion that the main question can be settled in an affirmative sense. That Grenfell-Hunt have not succeeded in proving this is due, as I have said, to the incorrectness of their first supposition. They say that the slave **Στρόβιλος**, who has a rôle in the only legible fragment of Hibeh 5 (verses 13 ff.) comes running on almost beside himself with delight immediately after the theft, with his booty, and think that he was stopped by his master, Lyconides, and caught as a thief. I shall presently prove in detail that they have not given a good picture of Strobilus' frame of mind and of the situation; here I only state that a scene in which Strobilos is caught by Lyconides immediately after his theft is as unthinkable in the original plot as it is unfindable in the *Aulularia*. Lyconides could not arrest the thief before he knew that a theft had been committed. This, however, he could only learn from the robbed man himself, from Euclio as he entered the stage. And the robbed person is running after the thief, so that Strobilos arrived before Euclio; consequently Lyconides cannot have caught his slave immediately after the deed. Another argument leads us to the same conclusion. The scene where Euclio informs Lyconides of the theft (verses 727—807) would be without a basis, and therefore impossible, if Lyconides had already caught the thief. For the capital misunderstanding of this scene is exactly based on the circumstance that Lyconides does not know anything of a stolen treasure any more than Euclio knows anything about the rape of his daughter's honour. It is therefore an essential requirement of the plot that the scene of the successful thief and that of the suspected thief should be separated by the scene in which Lyconides learns from Euclio the unexpected news that a big treasure has been stolen which belongs to Euclio[1]). As the scene

1) It is therefore not mere chance, but a logical necessity that Plautus has this order of events. On that account the suggestion made by Blass (Rh. Mus. 1907, pp. 102 ff.) as a reply to Leo's criticism, that *Aulularia*

postulated by Blass and Grenfell has apparently not existed, their attempt to corroborate their thesis by means of so-called parallels from Plautus' text was accordingly a failure. The 'parallels' between the *Aulularia* and the combined fragments of Hibeh 5 and Grenfell II 8 have been derived criss-cross from all parts of that play (verses 702—704, 781, 691 ff., 98—99, 274) and do not have any conclusive force either each by itself or all together.

If, as I consider it to be a fact, papyrus Hibeh 5 is a fragment of V 3 of the *Greek Aulularia,* it is superfluous to look for parallels in Plautus'text. For that text ends abruptly before the conclusion of V 1; consequently the Latin adaptation of V 3 has got lost. Therefore the proof of the correctness of my opinion can only be based on two grounds, first on the slave's name **Στρόβιλος,** secondly on the similarity between the action fixed and restored for V 3 and that which is in evidence in the main fragment of Hibeh 5 (verses 13—23). The interpretation of these eleven verses will have to demonstrate the identity of the two situations.

As Blass has rightly asserted contrary to Leo [1]), the slave's name **Στρόβιλος** [2]) is and remains a strong argument for the ascription of the fragment to the original of the *Aulularia.* For 'Strobilos' is a speaking name and an unusual name; it is even probable that it has been invented by the poet for this particular case [3]). But however that may be, the chance is very slight that Plautus has not derived his slave's name '*Strobilus*' from the model of the *Aulularia* but has invented it himself, for it is pure Greek in contrast to the many pseudo-Greek names in Plautus which by their hybrid form bear the sign of falsification. So the state of the question is this. In the

verses 701—712 and verses 808—833 are two fragments of an original whole which has been split up by Plautus by a transposition of the scene 713—807, is utterly unacceptable. Blass' reference to **νομαρχ-**, verse 81, too, in view of the Egyptian connections of Philemon, is irrelevant, because verse 81 belongs to Grenfell II 8, not to Hibeh 5. His anti-critique has only value because of the proof positive it affords that Leo's interpretation of the principal fragment of Hib. 5 (verses 13 ff.) is untenable.

1) Vide Leo, Hermes 1906, p. 629; Blass, Rh. Mus. 1907, p. 105.

2) 'Whirlwind', cf. Menand. Fragm. 536 K and *Samia* verse 210: **στρόβιλος οὐκ ἄνθρωπός ἐστι.**

3) This is not certain, for it occurs on an Imbrian inscription, *I. G.* XII 8 No. 124 (Bechtel, *Die histor. Personenn.* p. 605).

original of the *Aulularia* the slave was almost certainly called Strobilos. That name does not occur in any other comedy but in the fragment of Hibeh 5. Therefore it is difficult to assume that this similarity is based on mere chance. Accordingly it is very probable that it is a result of identity.

For a development of my second argument it is necessary to give an extensive and detailed discussion of the Greek verses. It is my intention to demonstrate that these verses in themselves do not contain a word from which we must conclude that a slave appears here who, almost beside himself with delight, carries a treasure just stolen and is caught by his master. On the contrary, this is a preconception, and a wrong one. In reality the slave Στϱόβιλος is without any booty and is flying in great fear, while he is being driven on by an apparition. In order to prove the various points I shall first subject the explanation given in the *Hibeh Papyri,* and in connection with it the names added to the text, to a detailed criticism, and then substitute my own interpretation for it. Next I shall reproduce the Greek text supplemented and distributed among the interlocutors in such a way as seems acceptable to me, and shall conclude with the notes which will still be necessary then.

Grenfell-Hunt describe the situation with the following words[1]: 'We suppose that the discovery (sc. of the treasure) has just preceded the scene disclosed in ll. 13 sqq. of the papyrus. The slave Strobilus (l. 21 παι... Στ⟨ϱ⟩οβιλε) *is almost beside himself with delight*[2] (ll. 15—19, 22) and is anxious *to get away* with the utmost speed (ll. 13—14); *while the interlocutor, who arrives on the scene* and is presumably his master, is astonished at Strobilus' behaviour (l. 15), and thinks that he must have gone mad (l. 21 παι δυστυχες)'. Their translation, in which the speakers have been supplied in the places which in the MS have been denoted by *paragraphos* or open spaces, runs thus (verses 13—23):

13 *Strobilus.* Imagine... that you are running at Olympia!
14 If you make your escape you are a lucky fellow!

1) Cf. Blass, Rh. Mus. 1907, p. 103. Schroeder's sketch (*o.c.* p. 13) comes to the same thing.
2) Spacing by me. W.K.

15 *Lyconides.* O Heracles, what ever can have happened?
16 *Strobilus.* Now I know certainly that of all the world
17 this spot alone is clearly sacred,
18 and here all the gods have made their home
19 and still are, and here have they been born.
20 *Lyconides.* Strobilus! *Strobilus.* Apollo and the gods, what breath!
21 *Lyconides.* You miserable slave, Strobilus! *Strobilus.* Who called me?
22 *Lyconides.* I. *Strobilus.* And who are you, most mighty of the gods?
23 *Lyconides.* How fortunately I have seen you.

The first verse shows, irrefutably, that the slave rushes up the stage full-speed, as is also imagined by the editors, who rightly give the following note on **νόμιζε**: 'Strobilus is apostrophizing himself'. But from the hurry in which he arrives it does not appear that he wishes to leave as soon as possible, and in verses 15—19 and 22 there is not a word about overpowering delight. In verse 14 Strobilos speaks of 'escape', consequently he is threatened by danger, he rushes on from fear, and if the verses quoted denote an excess it is an excess of fear, not of delight [1]). The only word denoting luck occurs in verse 14. Strobilos says: **ἐὰν διαφύγῃς, εὐτυχὴς ἄνθρωπος εἶ,** but he means: 'if you escape you may call yourself happy'. He who understands: 'if you escape your fortune is made' [2]), starts from the preconception that Strobilos wishes to put in safety a treasure which he has just stolen. But there is not a word in these verses which shows that he carries such a thing or anything whatever along with him.

The speaker of verse 15 is not 'astonished', but worse: he is alarmed at suddenly seeing the slave rushing on in great fear [3]). The editors call that speaker 'Lyconides' and say that he 'arrives

1) Schroeder paraphrases verses 15—19: *'omnes deos hic adesse benignos scio'*, but there is nothing like *'benignitas'* in the text. Weil (Journ. des Sav. 1906, p. 514) renders Strobilus' mood very well.

2) Cf. Blass p. 103: 'Der Sklave denkt erst an Behalten und Durchbrennen'.

3) Verse 15. **ὦ Ἡράκλεις, τί ποτ' ἐστὶ τὸ γεγενημένον;**

on the scene'. At verse 22 they give this note: 'Strobilus keeps up to the idea of ll. 16 sqq., and affects to think that his master is a divine apparition'. They postulate four things in all: that the speaker of verse 15 enters the stage at this verse, that it is Lyconides, that Strobilos shows that he noticed him, and that he affects to take him for a divine apparition. These four theses would only come in for consideration in case it could be proved that Lyconides entered the stage as Strobilos' persecutor. For the slave arrives flying from a danger he wished to escape. Consequently, when he enters the stage he is being persecuted or feels he is persecuted, and addresses the persecutor as a deity in verse 22 [1]. However, the assumption that Lyconides was that persecutor clashes with the action of the *Aulularia* and likewise with the action of the original of the *Aulularia*. For Lyconides does not go away from Megadorus' house after having arrived there in verse 682. Therefore it is certain that there is a persecutor and that Lyconides is not that persecutor. Can it be proved that the speaker of verse 15, whoever he may be, is Strobilos' persecutor? On the contrary, in my opinion it can be proved that he is not. For this speaker gives utterance to his sudden fright at what he sees before him. It is therefore improbable that he has already seen the fearful slave outside the stage and is running after him. If he does not run after him, but comes out of the house or is at that moment already on the stage, then Strobilos cannot pretend that he takes him for the divine apparition from which he is flying and which in verse 22 he addresses with the words '**ὦ κράτιστε τῶν θεῶν**'. For it is the speaker of verse 15 whom he sees before him—no matter whether it is his master or somebody else—whereas he knows that the apparition is behind him. Consequently he could not possibly incarnate the deity to whom he alludes in verses 13—14 and who drives him on to the stage, into the person on the stage who makes *acte de présence* in verse 15. In this way I think I have demonstrated that by the side of Strobilos there are two persons playing a part, not one [2]. There is the speaker of verse 15, Lyconides or somebody else, who is on the stage or comes out of the house and is alarmed at the sudden

1) Verse 22. **σὺ δ' εἶ τίς, ὦ κράτιστε τῶν θεῶν;**
2) Here Leo is right.

appearance of the excited slave; there is Strobilos' persecutor to whom he alludes in verse 14, whom he addresses as a deity in verse 22 and denotes as a deity as early as verses 16—19 and in verse 20. Strobilos' exclamation in the last-mentioned verse: '"Απολλον καὶ θεοί, τοῦ πνεύματος', is clearly his reaction to the cry 'Στρόβιλε' which the god, who is persecuting him, blows into his back as it were [1]). This resounding 'Στρόβιλε' affects him like a gust of wind which makes him stagger. It seems to me that even Strobilos' words of verse 20 alone are to be considered as a proof that his opposite number in the dialogue of 20—24 is not the human speaker of verse 15, in other words: is not Grenfell-Hunt's Lyconides. It is a superhuman apparition beheld by Strobilos.

The action which I gather from the verses may be thus described. The slave Strobilos is flying or pretends to be flying to the stage from a divine apparition, which had already appeared to him outside the stage. When Strobilos has arrived there he gives a demonstration of the terror he has experienced, and then in order to impress those present, whom seemingly he does not see, he reflects on his wonderful experience (16—19) with a great show of importance. But suddenly the god summons him by calling his name in a thundering voice (20). Strobilos tries to exorcise the disaster by invoking Apollo and the other gods (20), whereupon the voice, annoyed and impatient [2]), pronounces Strobilos' name anew (21). Strobilos asks who has called him (21), and as the reply 'I' does not make him any the wiser, he puts his question anew in verse 22, and this time more directly and respectfully, and a third time in verse 23, where the letters τις have been preserved. For in reply to his second question he only receives the reassuring communication that the god is glad to meet him. It may therefore be expected that at last the third

1) The editors say: 'πνεύματος may refer either to the loudness of Lyconides' shout, or, as Dr. Mahaffy suggests, to the supposed effluence of an approaching god; cf. e. g. Eur. *Hipp.* 1392 ὦ θεῖον ὀδμῆς πνεῦμα'. Both these explanations are partly correct, I think; τοῦ πνεύματος refers to the resounding voice of an approaching god. The explanation by Schroeder (Sudhaus): '*spiritus me deficit*', is not only erroneous, I think, but even impossible, because honestly speaking I have my doubts as to whether a Greek, τὸ πνεῦμ' ἔχων ἄνω, would really say: "Απολλον, τοῦ πνεύματος.

2) Vide p. 124.

question was answered by the god by mentioning his name, which has been partly preserved in verse 24, the letters σωσ̣ of Hibeh 5, to which Schroeder has added three dubious letters (ο̣γ̣γ̣) from *Flinders Petri* 4 [1]).

One cannot disregard the similarity between this action in Hibeh 5 and the action in V 3 of Plautus' model, which we have sketched above as the direct and inevitable result of the situation arisen in V 1. At the end of V 1 on Euclio's appearance Strobilus had hurriedly fled away to the right, leaving his master, who in V 2 received the answer to his proposal, behind; and in V 3, while his master was still talking with Euclio, the slave returned to the stage in great haste and alarm, as a god had appeared to him, the Heros, who through the requirement of the plot had the task to reveal where Euclio's gold was buried and thus to liberate Strobilus from the burden of suspicion. Here, in Hibeh 5, we find a slave, **Στρόβιλος**, who arrives hurriedly as he runs on his way, greatly alarmed as an unknown god has appeared to him, who persecutes him and summons him and reassures him and ultimately reveals his identity by mentioning his name. That on Strobilos' entrance the stage is not empty appears from verse 15. That here, too, a big treasure plays a part is seen from the letters **κροισ** in verse 28. And no doubt a scene immediately preceded in which something was told somebody that turned his anxiety into delight. For in verse 9 we read **χαίρειν βοᾶν** and in verse 11 something about **ἀτυχήματα** [2]). This tallies perfectly with V 2 of Plautus' model, in which Lyconides was graciously accepted as a son-in-law by Euclio [3]). Therefore the identity of the action

1) Schroeder p. 17. I think I see ο̣γ̣μ̣ι̣ς̣.

2) Verse 2 δ̣ώ̣σ̣ω Gr.-H., verse 9 **βούλο]μαι χαίρειν βοᾶν** Schr., verse 11 **ἀ]τυχημάτων** Sudh., verse 12 **ἀ]π̣ο[λ]υ̣θ̣ε̣ί̣ς̣** id. Schroeder's surmise that there was an entr'acte between verse 7 and verse 8 has not, I think, a sufficient foundation.

3) Probably this happened in the second half of the scene. Presumably Euclio was accompanied by Staphyla (cf. p. 114) when he entered the stage, for she must have effectually co-operated in Euclio's decision. By means of the words which she spoke to her master the poet gave an explanation of the long duration of his stay in the house, and that was the beginning of V 2. As on the other hand it is fairly certain that fragment Flind. Petr. 4, col. 1 immediately precedes Hibeh 5, col. 1 (cf. p. 115, note 4), it is possible that Staphyla's appeal to the miser has been preserved in the fragment

and of the characters is undeniable. Consequently I conclude that Στρόβιλος arrived in great haste from the right flying from the Ἥρως, while Lyconides and Euclio were just finishing their conversation on the other side of the stage. I subjoin the 12 verses distributed among the speakers and completed in the way I think correct.

Strobilos νό[μι]ζε ἀλι[τήριος] τρέχειν Ὀλύμπια.
ἐὰν διαφύγ[ηι]ς, εὐτυχὴς ἄνθρωπος εἶ.
Euclio ὦ Ἡράκλεις, τί ποτ' ἐ[σ]τὶ τὸ γεγενημένον;
Strobilos νῦν οἶδ' ἀκριβῶς, διότι τῆς οἰκουμένης
ἱερὰ σαφῶς αὕτη 'στὶν ἡ χώρα μόνη
κἀνθάδε κατ[ῳ]ικήκασι πάντες οἱ θεοὶ
καὶ νῦν ἔτ' εἰσὶ καὶ γεγόνασιν ἐνθάδε.
Heros Στρόβιλε. *Strob.* Ἄπολλον καὶ θεοί, τοῦ πνεύματος.
Heros παῖ δυστυχές, Στ⟨ρ⟩όβιλε. *Strob.* τίς κέκ[λη]κέ μ[ε;

mentioned. The following completion (in every verse circa 12 initial letters are lacking) is meant to prove that the possibility suggested is not merely theoretical.

(*Staphyla.*) δεῖ γὰρ μένειν σ']ἐνταῦθ', ἵν' α[ὐτὴν ἐγγυᾶις,
νομίμωι προσελ]θών, οἷός ἐστι, νυμφίωι.
δεδιδάχαμέν σ']ἡμεῖς μὲν ἤδη τοῦτό γε,
σὸν δ'ἔργον αὐτὸν] ἀλλά που τάχιστ' ἰδεῖν.
μηδ' αὖθις ἐνα]ντίως ἐκείνωι, Δημέα,
τοῦτ' ἐπινοήσ]ειας, ὅ τι διὰ τριῶμ μόλις
παρειλόμην βοῶν]τι καὶ χασμωμένωι
καὶ λοιδοροῦντι] τὸν στρατηγόν, νὴ Δία.
ἀλλ' ἐστράφης ὀρ]θῶς μὲν ἄλλην· ἔστι γὰρ
ὃ πρῶτ' ἔκρινες ἄδ]ικον εἰς ὑπερβολήν.
πραχθήσεται δ'ὑμ]έναιος οὗτος ῥαιδίως,
ἂν συμπονησῆι]ς ταῦτα· τοιγαροῦν σὺ μὲν
τοῦτον κόμιζε δ]εῦρο, καὶ μὴν ἃς ἔχεις
δὸς κλεῖδας ἵνα θ]ύωμεν ἡμεῖς, οὐκ ἔχει
[τὸ πρᾶγμ' ἀναβολήν.]

For a more detailed treatment vide Mnemosyne IIIa Ser. Vol. IX. Further the following is worth noting. If the fragment belongs to V 2 of the original of the *Aulularia*—and even apart from the above reconstruction this is probable—then Euclio was called '*Demeas*' there. As a result of this Choricius p. 32, 73 (vide p. 9 ff.) is disposed of as a proof that Menander was the author of the original.

Heros ἐγώ. *Strob.* σὺ δ'εἶ τίς, ὦ κράτιστε τῶν θ[εῶ]ν;
Heros ὡς εἰς καλ[όν] σ' ἑόρα[κ]α. *Strob.* τίς [δ'ὤν, εἰπέ μοι.
Heros Σωσόγμιο[ς ἥρως] ε[ἰμὶ

I wish to add some further notes. In their transcription the editors estimate the lacuna behind αλι in verse 13 at 6 letters, and afterwards at 4. I think that the former estimate is correct. Schroeder reads Λά[μπ]ιδος. The word ἀλιτήριος is specifically employed where the awe for divine wrath is in evidence, and occurs in all the periods of Comedy. Verse 15 is to be attributed to Euclio, because Strobilos' arrival is intended for him, not for Lyconides. In verse 18 κατῳκήκασι is a very acceptable emendation of the editors for κατ[ο]ικησασι. In verse 21 the word δυστυχές is employed as an expression of impatience and annoyance in the sense of 'cursed', as Menander e.g. has it in *Epitrepontes* verse 1 C. In verse 23 the letters τις which have come down to us clearly prove that Strobilos asks anew after the god's name, so that there is every reason to read in verse 24 Σωσόγμιος or something of the kind as a reply thereto, as the Heros' name. The mention of that name—a Heros' name invented for this play, which reminds us of Demeter's epiklesis ἐπόγμιος [1]) — fully convinced Euclio of the veracity of Strobilos' vision.

From verse 25 onward the remnants are too slight for us even to guess the context. Therefore it is impossible to determine whether Euclio learned the hiding-place of his treasure direct from the mouth of the Heros or later on and indirectly, because Strobilos had first been called away by the god and having returned shortly after that repeated what the god had said [2]). If Strobilos not only played his own rôle but also that of the Heros, this turn would be obvious,

1) Suidas under ὄγμος: καὶ Ἐπόγμιος Δημήτηρ, ἡ ἔφορος τοῦ θέρους, Eustath. Σ 546, p. 1161, 59: ὄγμου δέ, φασί, παράγωγον Ἐπόγμιος, ἐπίθετον Δήμητρος, Anth. Pal. 6, 258: ὦ Δάματερ ἐπόγμιε. (Usener, *Götternamen*, p. 243).

2) If, in agreement with Blass, one completes the letters κροισ in col. 3 verse 1: Κροίσ[ῳ λαλῶ σοι καὶ Μίδᾳ καὶ Ταντάλῳ, Philemon fragment 189 K., it may be surmised that Strobilos addressed Euclio with these words. But, although those letters suggest the mention of wealth, the completion is one out of many possibilities, and as far as we know Philemon, the chance that he has written the original of the *Aulularia* is not great.

because his task would be lightened by it, while all the same Euclio's belief in the veracity of Strobilos' vision would remain intact. But however this may be, and leaving on one side the question whether we are to assume a real apparition or a cool-headed act of deceit, I think it is certain that through the interference of Strobilos Euclio received the announcement that he could find a treasure in his garden, a treasure which had been deposited there by the Heros for the defrayment of Phaedra's dowry [1]). Maybe that out of incredulous suspicion Euclio swore that he would not only yield a dowry but the whole treasure if the miracle proved true. This is only a surmise, but we may be convinced that he entered the house to return shortly afterwards with the pot dug up from the place indicated.

It goes without saying that in the meantime father Megadorus was also fetched. Lyconides had Strobilos at his disposal to do this. The last scene brought all the characters together who were needed to formally speak the solemn words which had to precede the wedding, and also to grant Strobilos his liberty and an outfit in money, for which he will no doubt have asked.

I have pointed out before that the reconstructions of the lost conclusion of the *Aulularia* cannot teach us much or anything regarding the 5th act of the original. The same thing applies in the opposite direction. The four scenes of the Greek model—supposing they were as I have sketched above—have undoubtedly not been imitated accurately by Plautus. For what appeared to be the basis of the action of those scenes is not Plautus' starting-point, and Plautus could not stage the main point and the climax of their contents. For the supposition that the stolen treasure was hidden in Euclio's garden does not apply to Plautus; he has it concealed in Eunomia's house and in the chest belonging to Strobilus. Plautus' god could not betray the hiding-place, because in that case the thief would have been betrayed at the same time and a show of accompliceship would have fallen on Lyconides. And Plautus could not stage the slave's

1) This announcement made in the name of the Heros (cf. *Aul.* verses 25—27) might be an invention of Strobilos himself. For he knew that Lyconides wished to marry Phaedra, and understood his financial interest.

vision, the apparition of the god (the chief point and the climax of the 5th act), as Silvanus, the god from whom the gold had been stolen, had nothing to do with the treasure, with Phaedra and her marriage, while the Lar, the patron of Phaedra and of the treasure, was not concerned in the theft and was excluded from the action by his dwelling-place. For how was it possible for him, seeing that he lived in Euclio's house and had therefore to come out of that house, to drive a fugitive slave back to the stage? There is in fact nothing in the mutilated last scene of the *Aulularia* that points to such a dénouement. On the contrary, those 25 verses suggest that Lyconides has compelled his slave to make a complete confession and was at the same time prepared to come to an agreement with him so that, it is true, he forgot with a 'Plautine' ease what he had promised Euclio on oath, but reached the prescribed end in the quickest and simplest way possible, viz. the restitution of the money and the rescue of the slave. It is difficult to say what means Plautus has applied in order to make Euclio cede the money as a dowry for Phaedra as soon as he had got it. But it need not be expected that he has bestowed great care on the motivation. For motivations are nowhere Plautus' forte, and in the exodus he usually aims at a happy end with great push. It is therefore quite probable that Euclio unexpectedly renounced his miserliness out of gratitude and because he suddenly realized that he could only buy his peace of mind and his night's rest with his gold. That we do not do an injustice to Plautus by our supposition is proved by the scene which has been preserved of this exodus, where he has the cunning slave Strobilus commit the stupidity of fully betraying himself as a thief.

It is not my intention, taking that last scene as a starting-point, to give a retrospective survey of all the scenes where Plautus has failed in dramatic art. But I do wish to point out again that, by his cuts and his insertions, his substitutions and transpositions, he has dislocated the composition of his model and that he has mutilated or disfigured all the principal characters except Euclio. In the *Aulularia* Strobilus has become a dramatic problem, and Eunomia a marionette, whose unenviable task it is to cloak her superfluity with words; Lyconides, the lover, arrives in the nick of time for a confession which he ought to have made many months previously; for

the poor Megadorus there is no part left when we are only half-way in the play, and the 'faithful foster-mother', Staphyla, who in the original marriage-comedy represented the typically feminine element and who as an exponent of opposition was stubbornly fighting for Phaedra's happiness until she had conquered the last resistance, has to pitiably remain in the back-ground as if the insane miser's will is her only law. With that cast of the play it is not surprising that *Aulularia* means to us 'the play of Euclio'. Where he enters the stage and when he is referred to, the action begins to live and has sense. The theft of his pot of gold is not only the vital point of the plot, but it is also the only topic that really holds our attention; the marriage-affair has only a secondary meaning and what Plautus has curtailed in this theme he has for the greater part compensated by means of scenes where the pot plays a part. Thus he made—as he has done more than once [1]—what was a means in his model into the principal topic of the plot, almost into the end in view, whereby the real end, which indeed had been mentioned as such by the god, became a secondary matter, degraded and tolerated as an element where it was indispensable, but not employed for its own sake. On that account this play of the *Aulularia* is strictly speaking a character-sketch rather than a stage-play. No one will deny his praise to the portrayal of the miser as given by Plautus, but a character-sketch does not make a drama. A drama ought to be an action wherein the conflict of various, equal persons gradually leads us to an unexpected and inevitable end. This end is in the New Attic Comedy the happiness of all the *dramatis personae*; to that end a higher power leads them even against their understanding and wish, while in its wisdom it utilizes their character and even their inverted strivings. If that action was to be called a work of art it had, as the Greeks thought, to present itself to the audience as a beautiful and well-proportioned whole, wherein the connection of cause and result was recognized. I hope I have shown that the original of the *Aulularia* met that requirement, and by its structure and composition possessed the formal perfection that may be expected of a product of the Attic dramatic art of this last flourishing period of Comedy. Plautus, however, had little regard for structure and composition,

1) E.g. in the *Bacchides, Epidicus, Casina, Mostellaria.*

for previous history and substruction, for themes and their reciprocal connection. His real domain was the scene; he was satisfied if his individual scenes gripped the audience. If the present study has shown anew this essential difference between Plautus and his Attic predecessors, it may perhaps also be of some importance for the knowledge of Roman Comedy. And possibly the conclusion may then be arrived at, that Plautus' creations of character are to a high degree products of mere chance, seeing that as a result of changes that had nothing to do with Art one trait was obscured and another emphasized, independently of his creative will, and if it happened with his will then certainly diametrically opposed to the intention of the original poet [1]. He who forgets this and poses the characters of Roman comedy as Attic originals in the picture-gallery of Greek character-portrayal commits an error which can only be pardoned because no one has entirely avoided it.

It has already been pointed out above that in the *Aulularia* the first and principal ground of Plautus' changes was not of an artistic kind but of a moral nature. Roman law and morals did not allow a marriage between near relatives. Therefore Phaedra could not be at once a relative and a wife to Lyconides. Consequently she had to be his wife and not his relative since her alliance with Lyconides was an incontestable element of the plot, both as the basis and as the aim of the history [2]. In Plautus' play there was no room for the supposition that Phaedra was Megadorus' daughter, no matter whether Lyconides became his nephew or remained his son. But in the Greek model this supposition was exactly the 'breech-block' of the dramatic construction, which connected the two theme-components with each other, brought about the turn of the action and justified the creation of the Eunomia-figure. Accordingly it is possible, if one desires it, to logically derive the bulk of Plautus' other changes from the necessary extirpation of that one element. For with

1) The same thing also applies, though in a less degree, to Terence's figures. A striking example is his Thaïs in the *Eunuchus*. Vide Kuiper, *Gr. orig.* p. 39. Jachmann's words (pp. 136 f.) about this 'poetical creation' by Menander have not anything to do with Menander, I think, nor with Terence.

2) In the *Epidicus* Plautus dispensed with the marriage. Vide Kuiper, *Epidic.*, cf. *Diph. i. d. Rud.*, p. 33.

that one element the central scene, in which Megadorus told the miser that he cancelled his promise of marriage disappeared of its own accord. Thus indeed the chain of events was broken; a link was removed and Plautus had to do without the scene and the occurrence which in the original led up to Euclio's discovery of the theft. The result of the disappearance of that scene was that Euclio had to bury the treasure as well as discover the theft of the treasure in one and the same absence. This was only possible if the successful theft was preceded by an unsuccessful theft. But the frustration of the theft implied that Euclio was to see the slave Strobilus face to face. On that account Plautus had to make his Strobilus into a slave whom Euclio did not know, ergo not to make him live with Megadorus, ergo to place his master's house outside the stage, and therefore to separate the young master from his father Megadorus and to make him into Eunomia's son and Megadorus' nephew.

It is obvious that in fact the whole series of changes is connected with the elimination of the motif of the relationship between the lovers. But that does not mean that all those changes were absolutely necessary and the inevitable logical results of the removal of this one *donnée*. For an adaptation might be conceived in which the *homopatrioi-motif* was eliminated, but in which Lyconides remained Megadorus' son and housemate, and was recognized as the guilty lover by means of Phaedra's ring, which would thus have performed one part of its original task. Strobilus' rôle need not be an absolute obstacle for such an arrangement. For, although a doubling of the theft was absolutely necessary, it might be conceived that Strobilus had indeed been disturbed by Euclio during his unsuccessful attempt to steal the gold but had not been seen by him, so that he might have remained what he was: a slave from Megadorus' house whom Euclio knew. As we see it would have been possible on the basis of this scheme to carry out an adaptation of the model without many important changes in the first three acts. By the side of this there was yet another possibility, viz. that the adapter—though for a reason to be mentioned presently he had detached Lyconides and Strobilus from Megadorus and his house—might have preserved the recognition of the young man by means of Phaedra's ring. Therefore there must have been two more reasons which compelled Plautus

to bring about his changes, apart from the relationship to which he objected. The one was the contributory cause that he made Lyconides Megadorus' nephew and changed his dwelling-place, the other that he has eliminated his recognition by means of the ring, with Staphyla as an opposite number. Although these reasons were not so imperative as the one already mentioned and are on that head not so immediately evident to us, nevertheless I think that they are plausible. If I succeed in proving this, I have at once proved their validity.

It cannot elude us that in the Greek play the conclusion brought Megadorus only delight and happiness, but in the *Aulularia* a misfortune and a mortifying disappointment. For in the Greek play his good fortune first saves him from an irretrievable disaster and next bestows a great happiness on him: he sees his bride, who has turned out to be his own daughter, as the wife of his son, her half-brother. So there was joyous thankfulness in his heart. But in Plautus' adaptation his unenviable share was necessarily that he had to yield his bride unwillingly as a cheated bridegroom and that quite undeservedly he made a fool of himself as a cuckold before his marriage through his nephew's guilt and the Lar's cruel stratagem[1]. And as there is nothing in his character why one should wish him to be hurt and to experience that misfortune, his figure and his history clash with the spirit of the Comoedia. It goes without saying that Plautus has felt this, and it is obvious that he has attempted to smoothe over the undesired effect of this inevitable turn. Therefore he does not bring the unfortunate Megadorus to the fore when the Job's news has to be told him; therefore he subsequently leaves him quietly in the house, so that he may be easily forgotten [2]; and above all therefore he has managed and arranged things in such a way that a light-hearted nephew was to blame for the misfortune of an uncle with whom he was not intimately acquainted, because it would have been absolutely intolerable if Megadorus' own son had been obliged to inflict this humiliating misfortune on his father. For this reason therefore Plautus has summarily deleted Lyconides as Megadorus' son, changed his dwelling-place, removed his person

1) Vide verses 31—33.
2) Cf. Kuiper, *Epidic.* p. 46.

from the former half of the play, and limited his rôle to the latter part, where Megadorus is no longer needed for the action. In my opinion it may accordingly be said to be most unlikely that Plautus has availed himself of Megadorus in the lost conclusion [1]), and it is certain beyond any doubt that his intentions would be misjudged if it were thought that he has made Lyconides live with Megadorus [2]), so that this poor devil of an uncle, after having been duped by the unscrupulous Lar and by malicious fate, would have his stolen bride live in his house to the benefit of his miscreant nephew, by way of a last punishment for his innocence.

The reason why Plautus has deleted Lyconides' formal recognition along with the rest of the anagnorisis was twofold, it seems to me. The exhibit, Phaedra's ring, was in the Greek play the symbol of two kinds of alliance and consequently brought about two discoveries at the same moment, the most surprising of which set Eunomia her delicate task towards her brother by virtue of a secret which no one would ever have suspected. This complication gave the extraordinary effect to the scene of recognition, which exactly by that unexpected turn must have appealed to and fascinated an audience who viewed any innovation in the old theme with a connoisseur's eye. But what was left after the deletion of that complication was a silly and commonplace scene. From Plautus' work as well as from Terence's we see that the traditional Greek anagnorisis with its fixed properties did not fit in with their taste overmuch [3]), and no doubt their taste was the taste of the Roman audience in this respect. Plautus' opinion is evinced by the *Casina,* the *Epidicus* and the *Cistellaria*; in the first two of these plays he has deleted the scenes of recognition, although their contents did not compel him to do so, for he accepts the result [4]), and in the *Cistellaria* he makes the scene of recognition into a farce by means of Lampadio's interruptions [5]). That cannot be mere chance. We may say that the old-fashioned theme of the serious recognition, which the Greek dra-

1) Vide Legrand p. 376.
2) Vide pp. 46 ff.
3) Vide Kuiper, *Gr. orig.* p. 273 under Anagnorisis.
4) *Casina* verses 1012—1014; *Epidicus* verses 649 ff. (cf. Kuiper *Epid.* pp. 47 ff.)
5) Cf. Kuiper, *Gr. orig.,* p. 198.

matists preserved by refining it, has been changed by Plautus in his own way and adapted in his own style as often as the plot did not preclude this. And in the *Aulularia* there was not only a possibility of doing so, but it forced itself on him. For to Plautus the miser's gold and the theft were the principal matter, not the marriage, and what was left of the anagnorisis after the necessary reduction was a vulgar situation, an empty scene, where moreover Plautus would have had to utilize all kinds of factors which he had at first neglected, viz. a means of recognition which had not been mentioned, a lover who entered the stage for the first time, a Staphyla who had not the least reason to appear on the stage. Can we then be surprised that he chose the shortest way to the end and encompassing everything in a confession and a cry made Lyconides confess a guilt and a duty he had known very long, and made Phaedra corroborate that confession with the well-known shriek?

We therefore find Plautus' critical judgment and taste at work in the last of the three considerations which have determined his attitude towards the original. His first reason to bring about some changes was imperative, because it originated from a requirement of morals, but it was not connected with art. The second linked up with the first, but not as an inevitable result; part of the changes is therefore a well-intentioned attempt at recovering the damage done. They veil an unpleasant effect, which had arisen against Plautus' wishes. Although it appears from this attempt that Plautus had a sense of dramatic values and knew what Comedy meant—which no one has ever doubted—, yet his second reason for his changes was essentially a negative one, like the first, and had arisen from a deficiency, and was a product of embarrassment. The third only is positive and creative, born out of the free will to deviate from his model. That the 'exhibit' of this is to be found in the insignificant scene of recognition of verses 682—695 does not mean that the mountain was delivered of a mouse. This poor scene gives us a hint as to where we have to look for the authentic Plautus. We find him where he adds an unsuccessful theft to the real theft, and shows by the creation of the Fides-scenes how much this drama meant to him what it says in the title: The Play of the Pot.

A COMPARATIVE SURVEY OF PLAUTUS' AULULARIA AND ITS ORIGINAL

	AULULARIA	ORIGINAL	
Verses			**I**
1-39	Prologus. Lar Familiaris.		
40-119	Euclio-Staphyla **(I 1, 2).** *(Enter from Euclio's house; verse 66 E. exit into the house; verse 79 enters again from the house. Verse 103 St. exit into the house, verse 119 E. exit aside).*	= Euclio-Staphyla *(The same action. Exit E. to the right, cf. verses 105 ff.).*	**1, 2**
120-176	Eunomia-Megadorus **(II 1).** *(Enter together from Megadorus' house. E. advises M. to marry. M. has made up his mind to ask Euclio for his daughter's hand. Verse 176 E. exit aside, M. remains on the stage. —* **Verses 120-134, 144-147**a, **175**b-**176**a derived from the original **IV 5**).	Megadorus-Lyconides *(Enter from Megadorus' house. M. informs L. that he intends to ask Euclio for his daughter's hand. Exit to the left in order to make the same communication to Eunomia. Exit L. into the house after a monologue).*	**3**
		Heros *(Enter from the right. Explanation and disclosure: the origin of the treasure, unsuspected relation between Euclio's deceased wife and Megadorus; Phaedra, adventure with Lyconides, loss of her mother's ring; a means of rescue, cf. verses 31-33. Exit to the right).*	**4**
		ENTR'ACTE	

Verses	AULULARIA		ORIGINAL	
				II
176-267	Megadorus-Euclio **(II 2).** (*E. enters from aside. Promise of marriage. Verse 264 M. calls Strobilus out of the house and leaves for the market*).	=	Megadorus-Euclio (*M. returns from the left, E. from the right; further the same action*).	1
268-279	Euclio-Staphyla **(II 3).** (*E. informs St. of the arranged wedding; verse 274 leaves for the market; verse 279 St. exit into the house*).	=	Euclio-Staphyla (*The same contents; but Staphyla remains on the stage*).	2
			Staphyla-Lyconides (*L. enters from the house; after conversation with St. exit to the left in order to go to Eunomia. Exit St. into the house*).	3
			ENTR'ACTE	
				III
280-349	Strobilus-Anthrax-Congrio **(II 4, 5).** (*Enter from the market. Verse 334 Anthrax exit into Megadorus' house*).	=	Strobilus-Anthrax-Congrio (*The same action*).	1
350-362	Strobilus-Staphyla-Congrio **(II 6).** (*Strobilus calls Staphyla out of the house; verse 362 Staphyla with C. enter Euclio's house, Strobilus disappears unnoticed*).	=	Strobilus-Staphyla-Congrio (*Str. calls St. out of the house; she tells C. to enter the house and remains on the stage with Str.*)	2
			Staphyla-Strobilus (*St. requests Str. to go and warn Lyconides; then exit into the house*).	3
			Strobilus-Pythodicus (*Str. calls P. out of Megadorus'*	4

Verses	AULULARIA		ORIGINAL	III
			house and transfers the supervision of the cook to him; then exit to the left).	
363-370	Pythodicus **(II 7).** *(Enter from and exit into Megadorus' house).*	± =	Monologue of Pythodicus *(Exit into the house).*	
371-397	Euclio(-Congrio) **(II 8).** *(E. returns from the market; exit into his house).*	=	Euclio(-Congrio). *(The same action. E. enters from the right).*	5
398-405	Anthrax **(II 9).** *(Enter from and exit into Megadorus' house).*	=	Anthrax *(The same action).*	6
406-414	Congrio **(III 1).** *(Enter from Euclio's house).*	=	Congrio *(Enter from Euclio's house. Disappears to the right along with his helpers when Euclio comes out of the house).*	7
415-459	Euclio-Congrio **(III 2, 3).** *(Quarrel of E. and C. Between verse 444 and verse 449 E. fetches his pot from the house; at verses 455 ff. he sends C. into the house again).*			
460-474	Euclio **(III 4).** *(E. is firmly determined not to keep his gold in his house any longer, cf. verses 449-450).*	=	Euclio *(Comes out of the house carrying his pot, cf. verses 449-450, and conveys it along the stage to the right).*	8
475-493 <494-533> 534-586	Megadorus-Euclio **(III 5, 6).** *(Monologue of M. and conversation with E. Verse 579 M. exit into the house, verse 586 E. exit into the Fides-temple).*	± =	Megadorus-Euclio *(Analogous contents. Exit M. into the house, cf. verse 579, exit E. to the right, to the heroion).*	9

ENTR'ACTE

Verses	AULULARIA		ORIGINAL	IV
587-607	Strobilus **(IV 1).** (*Enter from aside as Lyconides' slave; exposes his master's frame of mind and his own task*).		Strobilus (*Enter from the left, returning from his errand, see III 3, 4, exit into Megadorus' house*).	1
608-623	Euclio-Strobilus **(IV 2).** (*Str. sitting near the altar is eavesdropping on E., who is coming out of the Fides-temple and enters his house at verse 615 in order to dress*).	± =	Euclio-Strobilus (*E. returns from the right, Str. eaves-drops on E. from behind Megadorus' door. Exit E. into his house, cf. verse 612; exit Str. to the right*).	2
624-627	Euclio **(IV 3).** (*Enter from the house, rushes into the temple*).			
628-660	Euclio-Strobilus **(IV 4).** (*E. drags Str. out of the temple; at verse 660 he enters it again*).			
661-666	Strobilus **(IV 5).** (*Str. hides himself in order to eavesdrop on E. again*).			
667-681	Euclio-Strobilus **(IV 6).** (*E. comes out of the temple, says where he is going to conceal the treasure and exit at verse 676. Str. follows him, 681*).			
682-700	Lyconides-Eunomia-(Phaedra) **(IV 7).** (*L. and E. enter from aside. L. confesses his guilt; a cry of Ph. from the house confirms the confession*).		Lyconides-Eunomia-Staphyla (*Enter L. and E. from the left; while they are talking in front of Euclio's house St. leaves it. Recognition due to the ring. E. sends L. into Megadorus' house in order to call Megadorus. Exit St. into Euclio's house*).	3

Verses	AULULARIA		ORIGINAL	IV
			Eunomia *(A brief soliloquy on her discovery).*	**4**
			Megadorus-Eunomia *(E. reveals to M. the possible danger with which an alliance with Phaedra confronts him, and shows the ring. Exit E. to the left).*	**5**
			Megadorus-Euclio *(E. comes out of the house with his offering, cf. verse 612. M. cancels the promise of marriage. E. rushes away to the right. After a brief monologue M. goes into his house).*	**6**
701-704 <**705-708**> **709-711** <**712**>	Strobilus **(IV 8).** *(Str. enters with his booty; on Euclio's approach he leaves the stage on the other side in 712).*	=	Strobilus *(Enter from the right carrying his booty, then exit into Megadorus' house).*	**7**
			Lyconides-Strobilus *(L. sends Str. to Staphyla and returns into Megadorus' house).*	**8**
713-726	*Euclio* **(IV 9).** *(Enter from aside after the discovery of the theft).*	=	Euclio *(Enter from the right. The same action).*	**9**
727-777a <**777**b-**787**a> **787**b-**795** <**796-800**a> **800**b-**802**a <**802**b-**806**a> **806**b-**807**	Lyconides-Euclio **(IV 10).** *(L. hears about the theft, E. about the violation of his daughter; verse 802 E. exit into his house, L. resolves to wait for Strobilus).*	=	Lyconides-Euclio *(The same contents. Exit E. into his house, cf. verse 802; exit L. into Megadorus' house).*	**10**

ENTR'ACTE

Verses	AULULARIA	ORIGINAL	V
808-833	Strobilus-Lyconides **(V 1).** ± = (*Str. enters from aside; tells L. his theft and the hiding-place of the stolen gold*). Cetera desunt.	Strobilus-Lyconides (*Str. comes out of Euclio's house carrying the pot borrowed from Megadorus, see verse 390; his ruse fails and he flies away to the right on Euclio's approach*).	**1**
	Cetera desunt.	Euclio-Staphyla-Lyconides (*St. admonishes E., vide pap. Flind. Petr. 4 col. 1, and returns into the house. E. talks to L., vide pap. Hibeh 5 col. 1.*	**2**
		Strobilus-Euclio-Lyconides-Heros (*Str. enters from the right, persecuted and summoned by the Heros, vide pap. Hibeh 5 col. 2; he is told by the H. that a dowry for Phaedra lies buried in Euclio's garden. Exit E. into his house. Str. is sent away to fetch Megadorus*).	**3**
		Lyconides-Megadorus-Strobilus-Euclio (*Str. comes back with Megadorus; E. comes out of the house with the treasure he has found again. The official engagement; the liberation of Strobilus*).	**4**

REGISTER OF PLACES

(The numbers of the verses and the fragments are in italics)

Aulularia:

Argumentum I *13-15* 6.

Argumentum II *7-9* 6, *8* 6.

Text *1-5* 100, *1-39* 1, 100, *6* 106, *6 ff.* 39, *7* 41, 100, *7-8* 39, *12* 41, 101, *13* 41, 101, *13-14* 35, 101, *20* 101, *22-23* 101, *23 ff.* 101, *24 f.* 34, *25-27* 125, *25-33* 41, 113, *26* 39, 106, *27* 14, 102, *28* 24, 102, 106, *28-29* 98, 101, 104, *28-30* 101, 102, *29* 25, 53, 54, 60, *29-30* 60, *30* 55, 106, *31-33* 102, 130, *31 ff.* 102, 106, *34* 102, *34-36* 98, 102, *35-36* 24, *36* 57, *40* 15, *40-78* 2, *40-119* 67, *40-807* 99, *60-66* 62, 67, *63* 67, 104, 105, *65* 67, 104, 105, *67-78* 67, *70* 34, 40, *74-75* 55, 56, 104, *74 ff.* 22, 62, 68, 105, *79-119* 2, *80* 67, *87* 13, *91* 9, *91-97* 9, 10, *95-97* 9, *98-99* 117,

103 ff. 73, *104* 7, 38, *104-119* 38, *105* 105, *105-119* 7, 62, 67, *107* 7, *107-109* 104, *108* 7, *109-117* 15, *110* 67, *110-117* 105, *118* 7, *119* 29, 33, 51, *119-120* 33, *120* 22, 23, 47, 52, *120-121* 78, *120-134* 53, 71, 72, 77, 85, *120-175* 85, 105, *120-177* 2, *120 ff.* 22, 66, *123-124* 78, *124-126* 71, *130* 78, *131* 78, *133* 47, 69, 78, *133 f.* 47, *135-143* 71, *136-142* 71, *144* 72, *144-145* 47, 53, *144-147a* 71, *145* 49, 52, 53, 77, *147* 52, 72, 77, *147b-168* 71, *150-164* 71, *162-164* 53, *164* 71, *170-175* 71, *171 ff.* 33, 68, *172* 48, *172-173* 71, *174* 48, *175* 22, 48, 49, 52, *175-176* 48, 78, *176* 62, *176-177* 33, 34, *176-279* 63, *176 ff.* 68, *178* 51, *178-267* 2, *185* 15, *188* 15, *194-198* 15, *200-202* 15,

206 13, *215* 35, *216* 15, 83, *220 ff.* 15, *224* 35, *228-235* 35, *238-241* 15, *242-244* 40, *255-260* 15, *263* 87, *264* 24, 30, 42, 51, 63, *265-269* 15, *268* 73, *268-274* 73, *268-279* 3, *271* 56, 63, 72, *274* 30, 51, 62, 63, 117, *274-275* 63, *274-279* 63, 72, *274 ff.* 22, *276* 56, *276 f.* 22, 55, *277* 63, *278-279* 63, *279* 29, 68, 73, *279-280* 30, *280* 24, 29, 30, 31, 42, 51, 73, *280-320* 13, *280-362* 38, 39, 42, 44, *280-586* 33, *280 ff.* 3, *289-320* 42, *299-301* 9, 11,

302 9, *309-310* 89, *329-330* 39, *334* 42, *350-351* 42, *351* 42, *354* 42, *362* 3, 24, 30, 42, 52, 64, 68, 73, *362-363* 52, *362 ff.* 42, *363* 43, 64, 73, *363-370* 3, 30, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, *370* 29, 30, 44, 64, *371* 30, 31, 39, 51, 68, 86, *371-379* 38, *371-384* 10, *371-387* 3, *371-389* 30, *373* 13, *376* 13, *376-377* 13, *377-384* 15, *380-381* 13, *383* 13, *384* 13, *385* 13, *385-387* 86, 90, *388-405* 3, *390* 12, 86, *390-391* 12, 111, *390-393* 12, *391-397* 15, *394-395* 87, *394-397* 8, *397* 18, 29, 39, *398-402* 86, *398-405* 29, 31,

403-405 86, *405* 29, *405-406* 29, *406* 29, 30, 88, *406-414* 3, 88, *409* 86, *412* 86, *414* 86, 87, 88, 89, *415* 87, 88, *415-448* 86, 88, 89, *415-459* 3, 16, *419-422* 88, *444*

88, 89, *445-448* 88, *449-450* 15, 89, *450* 89, *451-459* 88, 89, *452 ff.* 87, *456-457* 10, *458* 89, *459 b* 87, *460* 90, *460-586* 4, *460 ff.* 15, *462-464* 68, 87, *467* 40, *473* 90, *473-474* 37, *474* 90, *475* 51, *475 ff.* 76, 89, *494-533* 7, 17, 20, 85,

503-504 7, *535-536* 7, *536* 90, *537-580* 90, *537 ff.* 90, *539-540* 91, *551-552* 87, *551-557a* 87, *551-559* 87, *551 ff.* 15, 87, *558-559* 87, *563-567* 91, *569* 18, *571* 18, 89, *572-627* 18, *575 ff.* 91, *577 ff.* 51, 91, *579* 79, *580* 89, *582-672* 94, *583 ff.* 35, *585* 35, *586* 29, 31, 37, 91, 92, 93, *587* 24, 31, 32, 44, 45, 50, 64, 68, *587-607* 4, 19, 31, 38, 43, 50, 96, 99, *587-623* 92, *587-681* 42, 49, *587-807* 33, *587 ff.* 24, 42, 49, 97, *592-598* 99, *594* 19,

603 24, 25, 42, 53, 60, 99, 106, *603-604* 96, 98, *603 ff.* 32, *604* 19, 45, *605* 97, *605-607* 98, *606* 19, 79, *607* 19, *608* 51, *608-615* 42, *608-623* 4, 35, 99, *608 ff.* 68, *612* 78, 93, 95, *612-613* 68, 79, *614-615* 99, *615* 35, 92, *616* 42, 99, *616-619* 42, *616-623* 93, 99, *616 ff.* 32, 42, 50, *618* 99, *619* 42, 82, 97, 99, *621-622* 35, *621-623* 99, *623* 29, *624* 79, 95, *624-627* 95, *624-660* 36, *624-681* 4, 79, 91, 92, 96, *627* 29, 93, *628* 18, 95, *628-660* 16, *628-676* 35, *628-681* 18, 50, 93, *628 ff.* 18, 36, 42, 96, *661-681* 36, *661 ff.* 95, *667 ff.* 95, *672* 13, *673* 94, *674-675* 34, *676* 35, *676-681* 25, *676-713* 94, *677-712* 25, *678-679* 80, *680* 32, 36, 98, *680-681* 97, *681* 29, 32, 74, *682* 22, 23, 32, 45, 48, 64, 69, 92, 98, 104, 120, *682-695* 48, 66, 132, *682-700* 5, 25, 32, 55. 59, 62, 64, 85, 91, 92, 94, *682 ff.* 31, 49, *687* 75, *688-689* 60, *688-693* 60, *689* 53, *691* 25, 58, 92, *691-692* 92, *691-693* 54, *691 ff.* 117, *694-695* 48, 49, *694 ff.* 48, *695* 78, *696* 97, *696 f.* 45, *697* 45, *700* 29, 92, 93,

701 31, 74, 80, 83, *701-704* 80, *701-711* 69, *701-712* 5, 25, 117, *701 ff.* 80, 82, 94, *702-704* 117, *705-708* 80, *709* 38, *709-711* 80, *710-711* 94, *711-713* 81, *712* 69, 80, 81, 108, *713* 31, 70, 81, 82, 95, 96, *713-726* 5, 82, *713-807* 82, 117, *726* 49, *727* 5, 45, 49, 50, 51, 70, 82, *727-807* 32, 79, 92, 116, *728* 50, 82, *729* 84, *730* 82, *731 ff.* 83, *745* 24, 61, *772-776* 16, 56, 84, *773-776* 111, *774-775* 112 *777-780* 5, 83, *777 ff.* 83, *777b-787a* 83, *779* 45, *779-780* 23, *781* 117, *781-800* 5, *783* 22, *789 ff.* 60, *793* 60, 84, *794 f.* 24, *795*, 57, 61, *796-800a* 84 *796b-798* 58, 84, *798* 57, *800-802* 16,

801 70, *802* 25, *802b-807* 84, *804* 97, *806-807* 25, 55, 114, *807* 5, 55, 56, 74, 81, 113, *807-808* 29, *808* 32, 81, *808-810* 111, *808-833* 33, 70, 117, 125, *808, ff.* 108, *815* 25, 69, 81, *816-817* 109, *819* 111, *820-822* 109, *820-823* 109, 110, *821-824* 6, *823* 69, 108, 109, 110, *824 ff.* 109, *829-833* 109, *830* 109, 110, 111, *833* 6.

Fragment *3* 14, 34, 40; fragment *4* 14; fragment *5* 107.

Adelphi Terentii: *439* 51, *724 ff.* 84.

Adelphoi Menandri: 54, 62, 75.

Amphitryo Plauti: *32* 47.

Andria Terentii: *205-225* 62, *780* 84.

Aves Aristophanis: *603* (schol.) 12.

Bacchides Plauti: 58, 127.

Casina Plauti: 127, 131.

Cistellaria Plauti: 106, *284 ff.* 115, 131. (Cf. Synaristosai).

Dis Exapaton Menandri: 58.
Dyskolos Menandri: *fragm. 127, 128, 129, 130, 135, 136K* 9, 10; 11, 36.
Epidicus Plauti: *166* 52, *190, 361* 71; 127, 128, 131.
Epikleros Diphili: *fragm. 1 M* 12.
Epitrepontes Menandri: *14, 17, 84 J* 10, *25 J* 58, *153 J* 7, *392 J* 87; 54, 62, 75, 107.
Eunuchus Terentii: *9 f.* 11; 128.
Fabula incerta Menandri: 84.
Fragmenta Florent. Menandri: 106.
Georgos Menandri: *78 ff.* 35; 54, 62.
Hekyra Apollodori: 54, 75.
Heros Menandri: 54, 75, 106.
Hydria Menandri: 11, *fragm. 466K* 12.
Hymnis Menandri: 9.
Kolax Menandri: *109–111* 36.
Mercator Plauti: *930 ff.* 115.
Mostellaria Plauti: *859 ff.* 98; 127.
Perikeiromene Menandri: *109* 36, *42–50* 103; 106.
Phasma Menandri: 11.
Phormio Terentii: *153* 52.
Plokion Menandri: *fragm. 405, 406 K* 35.
Pseudolus Plauti: 36.
Rudens Plauti: *103* 10, *914–928* 98 103.
Samia Menandri: *210* 117.
Synaristosai Menandri: 75. (Cf. Cistellaria).
Thensaurus Luscii: 11.
Theophoroumene Menandri: 115.
Thesauros Menandri: 11, 12.
Thesauros Philemonis: vide Trinummus.
Trinummus Plauti: 36.